FORUM

Copyright 1946, by The Events Publishing Co.

Vol. CV APRIL, 1946 No. 4

The church in our society

The Function of Religion

By Theodore M. Greene

Visiting Professor of Philosophy, Stanford University

DOES the church, as one of our major institutions, have inner spiritual resources upon which it can draw to revitalize itself? What can it contribute to our society and to our individual lives? These are the questions which I should like to explore in this article, in a manner similar to my analysis of the school in last month's issue of the *Forum*.

It is much harder to discuss the ideal objectives of the church than those of the school for a number of reasons. In the first place, no properly informed person in our society seriously questions the value of education, though plenty neglect it or minimize its importance; whereas many thoughtful people in this secular age gravely doubt both the validity and the value of religious belief. Hence, the institution of the school does not require the defense which a religious institution does require.

Secondly, the school is basically the same kind of institution in all periods and lands, having the same larger objectives—the preservation, critical revolution, extension and dissemination of truth—whereas "religion" is a generic term embracing a great variety of historical religions which differ profoundly in belief, ritual and social implication. The "church", moreover, is the institutionalized expression of Christianity, which is only one among several world religions, and even within Christianity we find many different branches and sects which constitute the several churches of Christendom. Which of these shall we discuss here? And finally two very different conceptions of religion in general, and of Christianity in particular, cut horizontally across most of the branches and sects of the Christian church—what may loosely be called the dogmatic and the liberal conceptions. These three considerations, to which others might be added, make it difficult to know what we are talking about when we attempt to inquire into the nature of "the church" and its potential contribution today.

All I can do in this article is severely to restrict myself to what I, as a liberal Protestant, conceive to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be the true nature and function of the Christian church. This approval will leave untouched such important questions as the relation of Christianity to other religions, and the validity of the more dogmatic interpretations of Christianity itself, though my own views on these questions will somewhat reflect themselves in what I have to say.

By the "church", then, I mean the institutionalized expression of Christianity in all its many forms, that is, in the language of theology, the Church Universal. It is of course a human and social institution, but it is also regarded by Christians as having been established by God as the special vehicle for His continuing revelation of Himself to man. These two statements are clearly not contradictory, though the secularist will regard the latter to be false. It is also possible, and necessary, to distinguish the ideal from the actual church. The church as it actually exists in history exhibits all the grave weaknesses of human finitude; it approximates very imperfectly to its divinely prescribed character.

The church has three major aspects or functions which take on more or less different forms in its several branches and multiple sects. As a community of believers, worshippers and responsible moral agents, it expresses its corporate beliefs in a more or less explicit creed, it provides for corporate worship in a more or less elaborate and established ritual, and it prescribes more or less clearly what it conceives to be man's proper attitude towards his fellow man.

All Christians worthy of the name believe in God as a spiritual Being whose chief characteristics are love, righteousnes and mercy. They believe that God created the world, and man in it, for a purpose, and that He maintains continual contact with the world and mankind, eliciting man's fumbling search for Him and responding to this search in various ways. They believe that He revealed Himself most clearly to the Hebrew prophets and then uniquely in the historical person of Jesus, and that He continues to make Himself available at all times to all peoples but particularly in and through the church.

The spirit underlying all Christian ritual, whether in corporate worship or in private prayer, is dictated by these beliefs. The Christian's greatest duty and privilege is the worship of God; his highest reward is that communion with God which marks, from the Christian point of view, man's most perfect felicity. Worship also involves, essentially, the worshipper's realization of his own sinful state, that is, his indifference to or rebellion against God. This realization leads to contrition, a plea for forgiveness, and a sincere resolution to lead a more godly life. The church's rites are designed to promote and implement both the worship of God and the penitent appeal of the worshipper for Divine aid.

These beliefs and this complex act of worship, in turn, dictate man's Christian attitude towards his fellow men and make available to him the power more effectively to achieve this attitude and translate it into appropriate action. The Great Commandment summarizes admir-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ably the relation of Christian attitude and conduct to Christian belief in God. First, and basically, we are commanded to love the Lord our God with all our hearts, souls and minds. Secondly, we are commanded to love our neighbor as ourselves *because* we are all sons of the same Father and therefore brothers.

This hasty and wholly inadequate sketch of Christian creed, cult and conduct will suffice to distinguish in broad outline the religious and Christian from the humanistic points of view at their best.

The middle of the road humanist, who neither believes in God nor denies man's dignity and value by too closely associating his with his animal ancestors, believes that man is strictly "on his own", with his destiny in his own hands within the limits set by natural forces beyond his control. He conceives of man as being capable of envisaging ideals of personal and social perfection and of trying, individually and collectively, to realize these ideals. Unless he is very naive he realizes that these ideals can never wholly be actualized; utopia is a state never completly reached. Man is thus conceived to be essentially good, though always capable of evil, and indefinitely perfectable, though never perfect.

The Christian conception of man is both more pessimistic and more optimistic. It believes that there is that in all men which makes them love themselves more than others, injure those they love most, and worship false gods. This is the view of human nature referred to by the Christian doctrine of "original sin". But the Christian also believes that God's help is available to man and that, with this help, he can do what would be wholly impossible were man indeed entirely dependent upon his own resources.

KEY CONCEPTS

These two contrasting philosophies of life can be summarily compared in terms of three pairs of key concepts. The Christian believes that each individual can, if he only will, actually attain to that state which is referred to as "heaven"; that this felicity can be achieved through that radical change of heart entitled "conversion" or "salvation"; and that such salvation is release from the bondage of man's most radical fault, entitled "sin", i.e., repudiation of God's love. The humanist substitutes utopia for heaven, education in the widest sense for salvation, and evil for sin. The church's function, accordingly, is the religious analogue to the function of the school as man's most potent secular institution. It is to help men to escape from sin and achieve salvation through the worship of, and obedience to, God, as it is the function of the school to help men to escape from secular ignorance and perfect themselves through the individual and collective search for secular truth.

Having distinguished the church from the school as sharply as possible, we can now briefly consider their relation to one another. This relation depends upon how both the school and the church conceive of their respective duties and prerogatives. If the school is dogmatically secular in outlook, repudiating the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

church's claim to truth as patently false, and if the church's attitude is equally dogmatic, asserting that its interpretation of God and human destiny is final and absolute, it is hard to see how the two institutions can fail to regard each other as hostile rivals. On the other hand, in proportion as the school is dedicated to the search for *all* truth, including whatever religious truth may be available to man in and through the church, and in proportion as the church recognizes its human, as well as its divinely established, character, and so refrains from claims of absolute finality or certitude, it is equally hard to see how the school and the church can fail to support and strengthen each other.

DOGMATISM

The crucial factor would thus seem to be the factor of dogmatism. Dogmatism, or a dogmatic attitude should be sharply distinguished from dogmas or basic beliefs. Every community, in order to function as a community, must rest on certain basic dogmas, that is, on certain fundamental beliefs; that is precisely what constitutes any community, social, political, fraternal, professional or religious. Thus, all true scientists belong to an international community rooted in the common belief in the possibility of discovering more and more about natural phenomena and in the value of such discovery for mankind. The inability to accept either of these beliefs, or the unwillingness or inability to participate in the scientific search for truth, disqualifies any individual, however able or worthy in other respects, from membership in this scientific brotherhood. The community of artists rests on similar dogmas regarding art; a democratic community can exist only within the framework of basic democratic dogmas. The church has, therefore, no copyright on dogmas; if it is to persist or function as a genuine community it must, like the school, make acceptance of certain basic beliefs a condition of membership.

Dogmatism, in contrast, may be defined as the conviction that any specific belief or pattern of beliefs is final and absolute. This dogmatic attitude has frequently characterized political parties and other types of communities; it has in the past, and still does, prevail widely in the Christian church; and it is exhibited by all those who today are absolutely certain that science, or education, or some other human enterprise, will suffice to save mankind from the evils that beset it.

Thus the essence of dogmatism is not an acceptance of the dogmas of any given community; it is a particular kind of acceptance. It always involves a denial of human finitude and the ascription of infallibility to some human individual or institution or document. By its very nature such a dogmatic attitude must brand critical inquiry as intolerable—as socially reprehensible, or politically unallowable, or religiously impious. Witness the attitude of many whites towards negroes, or of many communists toward democratic principles and democrats toward communism, of many secularists toward religious belief and of many professing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christians concerning the infallibility of every word of the Bible or of the *ex cathedra* pronouncements of the Pope.

The effect of dogmas (in contrast to dogmatism) upon a society is good or bad depending upon their wisdom. If they are wisely conceived and steadfastly but humbly adhered to they can function as powerful instruments of human association; if they reflect a mistaken understanding of human nature and man's attempt to relate himself to reality they retard human progress instead of advancing it. But the effect of dogmatism is always decisive and blinding, for it closes men's minds to fresh insights and makes mutual respect and generous cooperation impossible.

I have emphasized this distinction between dogmas and dogmatism because it is crucial to an appraisal of the potential role of the church in our society. As a liberal Protestant I believe that it is possible wholeheartedly to accept the central tenets of Christianity, to participate in Christian worship with real sincerity, and to strive to love one's neighbor as oneself, all with an ever-present sense of human finitude and in genuine humility. I believe that the Christian dogma of creation asserts that God created the *whole* of man, including his mind, and that man has been given this mind to be used for the comprehension of God as well as of nature and society. I therefore believe that the reverent and critical use of the mind is as important in religion as is the scientist's use of the mind in the spirit of natural piety. This attitude, and not the acceptance or rejection of any specific beliefs, is the essence of liberalism, whether religious, political or social.

Only in proportion as this liberal attitude has prevailed in the secular search for truth has this search been vigorous and fruitful. It is this attitude which has made possible every advance in political organization and social cooperation. And only insofar as this attitude has characterized the life of the church has the church been able to purify itself, by healthy self-criticism, of beliefs and practices alien to the intention and spirit of its Founder. The fact that the Christian church has again and again in its long history reformed itself, revitalized itself, and thus safeguarded its own spiritual integrity testifies to its ability to do so again in these times of crisis and critical need.

What then, in the light of this analysis, is the potential contribution of the Christian church today? The answer to this question will of course depend upon one's own beliefs and point of view. If all religious belief is judged to be invalid, sheer superstition and illusion, any institution which fosters such belief and is rooted in it must be regarded as a menace and should be fought against with all possible energy. If the possibility of religious truth is admitted and Christianity is accepted as a lofty, if not the loftiest, expression of such belief, the church can be regarded as a valuable institution in proportion as it proclaims this truth in a truly Christian spirit.

If dogmatism is condemned in all its forms, in religion as elsewhere, the strong tendency of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

church to promote religious dogmatism must be viewed with grave concern and every effort must be made to combat it. If the liberal spirit is judged to be not opposed to steadfast Christian faith but consistent with it, indeed, essential to Christian humility and a Christian sense of finitude, all liberal tendencies in the Christian church should of course be earnestly supported. Those who read this article will assess the measure of health which the Christian church enjoys today and its actual and potential contribution to human need in very different ways.

All sincere Christians, meanwhile, will agree that the church is the most important institution in society, because it mediates to man what he most desperately needs. Christians are convinced that man's plight would indeed be desperate if he were wholly on his own, but that it is not desperate because God's help is available. With this help they believe that man can love his fellow men, can exorcise hatred, can promote justice and mercy on earth. And they believe that the church, as the community of Christian believers, has an essential function in this regard, for it alone can provide proper opportunity for corporate Christian worship, safeguard and transmit central Christian beliefs and mobilize man's potential expression of Christian faith in individual and corporate Christian action. These claims for the unique role of the Christian church can hardly be denied if one accepts the basic Christian tenets.

The practical question, however, remains. To what extent do the Christian churches actually perform their proper function? Critics of Christianity in all its forms are likely to do less than justice to what the church has accomplished and continues to accomplish not only in aid to individuals but in the active promotion of Christian goodwill among men. Professing Christians tend to be correspondingly blind to the many weaknesses of all existing churches—to their inertia, their lack of social consciousness, their fondness for ritual for its own sake, their theological dogmatism, their all too frequent self-righteousness and lack of genuine humble Christian charity. Many people who are disposed to take Christianity seriously are so impressed by the church's many failings that they despair of her future and turn to our other institutions as our only hope. But no sincere Christian can share this view, for he is convinced that no secular institution can possibly take the place of the church.

Both Christians and non-Christians, meanwhile, should remember three undeniable facts. The first is that no human institution is distantly perfect and that the sane attitude towards faulty but essential institutions is not to abandon them but to try to improve them, at least by public criticism, and preferably by constructive criticism from within. This certainly applies to government and industry, the school and the family. It applies equally to the church.

The second fact is the genuine progress which the church is making in strengthening itself and making itself a more effective vehicle for the Christian Gospel. The world-wide

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ecumenical movement, the excellence of some religious publications, the gradual improvement of many theological seminaries, and the leadership which some churchmen, like the late Archbishop of Canterbury, have shown in facing social problems with Christian resources, are evidences of inner vitality and healthy self-criticism.

The third fact is the desperate need in which our democratic society and the whole world stand today for spiritual insight and power. The urgency of this need is too obvious to require demonstration. It is a need for more knowledge, certainly, and for political, economic and social effort, but above all for genuine Christian love and for the passion for justice which such love begets. If, as Christians believe, the church is the only corporate expression and source of Christian love, the importance of the church today, whatever its failures past and present, is greater than that of any other institution, even the school.

In any case, I for one must record my deep conviction that the future of our society will very largely depend upon the church and the school working in closest harmony. In proportion as they are strong in their respective ways, the school in its concern for truth, the church in its effective regeneration of sinful man, the future is bright, however dark the present. In proportion as they are allowed to lapse into comparative ineffectiveness, all other institutions in our society and all of us individually and collectively are bound to suffer. Only one thing is sure; we will get what we deserve.

●If an auditorium is stuffy a window may be opened, but if a speaker is stuffy better use a door.

—*John Andrew Holmes*

● Ad in the *Washington Post*. "Permanent government official in immediate need of apartment, preferably unfurnished. Will divorce wife and commit two children to orphanage, if necessary."

●Last month in Rutherford, New Jersey, everybody had a good time at the first social and dance of Fire Company Number Three, except the hosts—the firemen. They were busy in the snow and cold fighting a big blaze in the business district.

●The other day on a crowded train a chauffeur, in his blue uniform, sat beside a pretty girl and discovered that she had lost her ticket.

"Where was your ticket for?" he asked.

"Winter Haven."

"Very well, I'll see to it," he said, as he left the car.

He came back in a few minutes and gave the girl a Winter Haven ticket.

"Oh, thank you so much," she exclaimed. "Where did you find it?"

"I just went through the train bawling out, 'Any tickets for Winter Haven?', and an old lady gave me this."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How to combine efficiency in administration with democratic process

Trade Unions: Bureaucratic or Democratic?

By Mark Starr

Educational Director, I. L. G. W. U.

CURRENT hysteria provoked by large scale strikes in the post-war world has resulted in a parrot cry for punitive restrictions against the unions. Alongside this scholars and investigators have been at pains to collect facts about union administration and leaders. Professor Philip Taft in the winter issue of the *Harvard Business Review* (Winter, 1946) showed the complexity of union administration, the important role of local officers in union-management relations, the advantages to employers of centralized union control and also that, contrary to widely circulated allegations, union salaries are not "equivalent of the rewards paid to business executives in positions of similar scope and responsibility."

At the January meeting of the American Economic Association, Professor Taft expanded his ideas in a paper "Democracy in Trade Unions." He spelt out why union officers must be given power to act for the union as a whole. Yet such power can be abused and the problem unions share with other corporate groups is "how to combine efficiency in administration with democratic processes." And it may be noted for later comment that Professor Taft, after showing that intervention by the courts will impair the effectiveness of the unions, suggests an impartial appeal body, preferably created by the labor movement itself, which would review appeals against officers' decisions by members.

In a sampling which he hopes to follow up by a more ambitious survey, C. Wright Mills published in the *Public Opinion* quarterly interesting details about the birthplace, education, political and religious affiliations and salaries of union leaders. His conclusion is that unions, particularly the C.I.O., offered workers' sons "a faster road to a position of power than any other organization except the armed forces during the last decade."

Most recently the C.I.O. itself has published an over-all survey of C. I. O. union finances and democratic methods (*Economic Outlook*, Feb., 1946) which received wide press comment.

But in the minds of many citizens the question remains: To what extent are union leaders the big bosses who reign supreme with life-long tenure? Institutions have always been the extended shadows of men. The American Federation of Labor was personified for many years by Samuel Gompers and later by William Green. The C.I.O. speaks through Phil Murray. The schmooz of the garment center teems with references to the Hillman and Dub-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insky outfits. The Teamsters Union is Tobin; the Carpenters, Hutcheson; the Musicians, Petrillo; the Miners, John Lewis; and so forth.

These personifications are not peculiar to unions. The New Deal meant "that man" to all our political mossbacks. The political parties, too, normally re-elect the same leaders unless, as in one recent case, a special revelation from abroad puts idolatry into reverse. In the case of the President there is a difference for the controversy about a third term of office does not arise either in a trade union or a corporation. No business could be effective if its managers were automatically changed at short intervals. The problem is to secure democratic control of general principles without sacrificing efficiency in day-to-day procedures, and to do this in trade unions which have grown both in size and responsibility.

HURRIED DEVELOPMENT

Because the strength of the trade unions increased over five-fold in the recent New Deal decade (1933-1943), there has not been time to develop in large sections of the trade union movement the extent and refinement of bureaucratic methods to be found in organizations with a longer growth and history. However, in the older sections of the labor movement there has appeared, as one would expect, the permanent tenure of office and the bureaucratic outlook, with its reluctance to consider new ideas. Perpetuation of union leaders in office by regular re-election marks the majority of the unions. In recent years, only in the U.A.W.-C.I.O. and the International Typographical Union (A.F.L.) have the elections of the chief officers been warmly contested. And this whether they were elected by referendum or convention vote. In the International Typographical Union no officer could be re-elected for more than two consecutive terms, but this was met usually by making him a member of the permanent staff.

The eternal struggle between youth and age that occurs in the family and in the community at every level appears, naturally, in the trade union movement. But because youth was taken into the armed forces for two World Wars, the older union officers held their positions with less challenge. In some new and large unions, such as the United Auto Workers, there is a keen and spirited rivalry for leadership. Some of the contests are based on differences in principles and tactics and others on rival personalities and factions which operate in unions as they do in the internal struggles of other institutions.

But many institutions are not so complex as a trade union, which must be a daily service organization looking after wages, hours and conditions, collecting dues in return for such care and requiring much more technical competency than, say, a bank or an insurance company. In addition, the union must have long-time social aims, provide welfare services, call for altruism and sacrifice on the picket line and join with other unions to secure general ideals for the workers and the community.

While exaggerated in some particulars, the analysis given in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Trends in Collective Bargaining" (p. 242) makes clear difficulties of maintaining internal union democracy.

This hybrid character of the union evokes corresponding contradictions and cleavages in the leader. He is called on to be a smart businessman on the one hand and on the other the champion of the underdog's cause. He is supposed to live up to both; and while his own adherents may admire him for business acumen, he is elsewhere under attack for not being a selfless crusader. The fact is, of course, that he is more the "idealist" in the first struggling days when the union is being built and trying to achieve recognition; he is more the pragmatist when the union gets entrenched and the realistic and practical business aspects supersede the altruistic ones.

As the union achieves status, and expands, power tends to concentrate at the top. In the beginning the union is run like any other embodiment of primitive democracy, like a town meeting, say, in which every taxpayer participates. But as the union keeps growing, and its affairs become more complex, and its functions multiply, a whole group of full-time, paid officials, usually the original sponsors of the union, come to the fore. They cope with the countless issues, large and small, that make up the union's existence. Into their hands gravitates more and more responsibility until the membership meeting, even the executive board recedes, as the group of paid officials, commonly called "the office," assume increasing control. The day-by-day decisions are theirs; and since such decisions shape policy, they acquire the fundamental policy - making authority. . .

Along with the tendency of power to gravitate to the top, and the indifference of the rank and file as long as things are going well, is a third factor, often overlooked Far more than most men in comparable vocations, the union official depends on his job for his livelihood as well as for the psychic rewards of leadership.

In some unions the president, with the consent of an executive board, which is often a rubber stamp, appoints such key functionaries as organizers who are liaison between local affiliates and the national office. He has a hand in the editorial policy of all publications. He furthermore names all committees (including the crucial credentials committee) for national conventions. The selection of delegates to these sessions, which form the legislative arm of unionism, in turn mirrors the same kind of machine control on the part of the local union officials as that used by the national leadership.

PREVENTING SUCH CASES

Sharply dissenting to this statement, union leaders maintained that such cases were the exception. Robert J. Watt, of the American Federation of Labor, argued stoutly that "American unions are far ahead of any other element in American life in the operation of democracy."

But what can be done to prevent these exceptional cases increasing and to maintain and enrich democratic practices? The universities are starting to train union administrators for work in labor journalism, labor research and statistics, industrial engineering, labor public relations and labor education despite the earlier neglect by the institutions of higher learning for the needs of the unions for administrative and intellectual skills. Such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

training should include warnings to the trade union expert and officers against the bureaucratic mind and against the danger of becoming mentally muscle-bound.

But a distinction should be made between the hired and appointed union administrators and the elected union leader who formulates policy. To some extent the elected trade union officer resembles the politician who has to watch the way the wind is blowing before he spits. Just as the politician is dependent upon votes, so the union leader must keep his ear to the ground to find out what his membership is thinking. Most trade union leaders have come up to prominence as the spokesmen of left wing militant groups, agitating for reforms and criticizing the older statesmen. When elected they, if they are going to keep their office and administer the union successfully, must be the spokesmen for all sections of the union and not only for one which secured a majority for them.

The leader in office has, of course, the tremendous advantage over his would-be rivals in that he personifies and embodies the union because his name is constantly before his members. This means that the union leader, if he behaves efficiently, can count upon his re-election. In some unions the union president is able to control because he has the power of appointing officers and thus build up a union machine which automatically re-elects the president and endorses his recommendations at the regular conventions.

Another difficulty faced by the unions at the present time is that they are not quite sure of the kind of leadership which will be necessary. If in the present post-war situation the policy of men like Sewell Avery prevails over that voiced, say, by Eric Johnston, then the union leaders will need once again their bullet-proof vests and be prepared to slug it out on the picket line in the old-fashioned way. They will need their inspirational oratorical powers to arouse the militancy of their members and to elicit outside sympathy.

However, if the unions retain and expand the legal status which is theirs and if labor-management cooperation also continues to expand, then the type of leader will be the person who fights with facts instead of fists and who will be a capable advocate of the union's cause to win public opinion to his side. Both the hard-headed, big-fisted leader as well as the newer type may develop bureaucratic attitudes because labor leaders are still human beings. Parents and teachers too, unless they watch themselves, become domineering over their children. But as Logan Pearsall Smith says: "The denunciation of the young is a necessary part of the hygiene of older people and greatly assists their circulation."

Workers' education, producing a mentally alert rank and file with a grasp of labor history and philosophy, would be a tremendous assistance to retain democratic processes. Educational activities in a union must steer clear between the two perils of creating an anti-administration opposition clique and a yes-man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chorus and thus avoid both blind acceptance and constant carping. Obviously union education supports the *status quo* in union administration just as education maintained by any institution. Yet that should not rule out the duty of constructive criticism and the discussion of dissenting opinion in union classes. Indeed, wise union leaders would encourage this.

In the union journal and in union meetings channels for discussion and criticism ought to be forever kept open. Union officers should welcome and encourage ideas and criticism from the younger members and these younger members, instead of being driven into permanent opposition (and being built up and flattered by the Communists and outside agencies to be used as their tools, which has happened in the case of some right wing unions), should be given posts of responsibility so that they can temper the fanaticism of youth with administrative experience.

Union leaders and business agents should see that the economic power which they hold through the closed shop and the union shop is never used to penalize individuals who disagree with them. (A staff member of a union, Will Herberg, in the *Antioch Review,* Fall, 1943, made an excellent critical and thought-provoking analysis of this danger.)

Presumably, bureaucracy exists when means become more important than the end sought and when rules and procedures are continued because persons have vested interests in their continuance. An awareness of the necessity of constantly examining both means and ends and a recognition that they can and must be changed to meet changes of growth—this would be the best antidote for bureaucracy in the unions as elsewhere. Unions should set up a court of appeal to which any member might go in case of suspected black-listing by his union, just as he would go to the union if the employer tried to blacklist him. In some instances the unions should set up such a court of appeals composed of officers in other unions and of trusted friends of labor from educational and legal circles. Fundamentally, the development of general civic intelligence and keen desire to apply democracy to industry and to trade union practices would be the real and lasting safeguards.

• A mother is a woman who runs a temperature of 103 every time her child's temperature hits 100.

—Des Moines Sunday Register

• Too many people are like buttons—always popping off at the wrong time.

—Arcadia News Leader

• An advertisement in an Indiana newspaper recently ran as follows: "160-acre hill farm in Southern Indiana, poor buildings and poor fences . . . not much of a farm, but a swell hideout from atomic bombs."

• A wedding ring is like a tourniquet—it stops your circulation.

—One Hundred and Eleven

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The London meeting was a successful start

The First U.N.O. Assembly

By Sidney B. Fay

Professor of History, Harvard University

THE first General Assembly of the United Nations Organization met at London for five weeks and a day, from January 10 to February 15, 1946. The Security Council sat a day longer to find a solution to the Syria-Lebanon problem. In these 37 momentous days of unremitting labor an enormous amount of work was accomplished—far more than had been generally anticipated—toward the establishment of a new agency for peace and for the amelioration of the world's sorely troubled affairs.

As Senator Vandenberg put it: In 37 days the United Nations turned a blueprint into a going concern. It turned an ideal into a reality. On January 10th we had only a pious dream. On February 16 we had organized, in working detail, the complete machinery for the General Assembly, for the Security Council, for the Court of International Justice, and for the functioning of every instrument of peace which this Senate envisioned when it underwrote this dream last July with but two dissenting votes. On January 10 we had a "scrap of paper." In 37 days we gave it life.

Virtually all the independent states of the earth, great and small, were represented with the exception of two groups: the ex-enemy powers (Germany, Italy, Japan, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Finland and Siam), and the powers which remained neutral during the war (Switzerland, Portugal, Spain, Eire and Sweden). Russia and Yugoslavia proposed the admission of Albania, but no action was taken on this proposal.

In contrast to the closed meetings of committees at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, the U.N.O. proceedings except for informal conferences, mostly among the Big Five in efforts to find compromise solutions of thorny questions, were given the fullest publicity. It was "open diplomacy" at its best.

The American delegation, avoiding President Wilson's mistake in 1919, included leading representatives of both political parties. It was headed by former Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, and included Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Senator Tom Connally of Texas, as well as distinguished Republicans like Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan and Mr. John Foster Dulles.

Regret was felt that Russia did not send her top diplomatic official, Foreign Commissar Molotov. His absence was one of many signs which cast doubt on the seriousness with which the Soviet Union regards U.N.O. However, M. Gromyko, the Soviet Ambassador to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States, made a cordial speech at the opening of the Assembly, and M. Molotov later sent his deputy, the famous Soviet lawyer and prosecutor, Andrei Y. Vishinsky. Though he did not reach London in time for the earlier sessions, when he did arrive, he made up for lost time by long contentious speeches mostly directed against Britain.

The sessions of the General Assembly were held in Central Hall, headquarters of the British Methodist movement, in Parliament Square near Westminster, in a part of London rich in associations with the long struggle for democracy and freedom.

During the autumn a U.N.O. Preparatory Commission under the chairmanship of Dr. Eduardo Zuleta Angel of Colombia had been hard at work drawing up proposals for the organization and election of numerous committees and commissions. That so much was accomplished in so short a time during 37 days was in good part owing to its work.

After an address of welcome by Britain's Foreign Minister, Ernest Bevin, the Assembly proceeded to its first task, the choice of a president to replace Dr. Zuleta, who opened the meeting as temporary president. The delegates from Russia, the Ukraine and Poland tried to rush the election by acclamation of Trygve Lie, Foreign Minister of Norway. But the Assembly voted to proceed, as arranged, by secret ballot. As a result, Britain's candidate, Dr. Paul Henri Spaak, Belgium's Socialist Foreign Minister, was elected by a vote of 28 to 23 over Trygve Lie. Later the Assembly chose seven Vice-Presidents, consisting of the delegation heads of the Big Five (Stettinius, Bevin, Vishinsky, Bidault and Wellington Koo), plus two delegates of the smaller nations (Dr. R. P. Lares of Venezuela and Heaton Nicholls of the Union of South Africa.)

Much more important was the election of the six non-permanent members of the Security Council. The Big Five are permanent members and their representatives were the same as their Vice-Presidents of the Assembly. The Soviet delegation objected to the election of Mexico and the Netherlands as non-permanent members. It tried to win its point by moving to postpone formation of the Security Council, but lost, both British and American delegates voting against the postponement resolution.

The six non-permanent nations elected to membership in the Security Council and their respective representatives were Australia, N.J.O. Makin; Brazil, C. de Freitas-Valle; Poland, Z. Modzelewski, all for two-year terms; and Egypt, Abdul Hamid Badawi Pasha; Mexico, A. R. Diaz; Netherlands, E.N. van Kleffens, for one-year terms. Mr. Makin of Australia was named chairman of the Security Council for the London meeting, being chosen for the post on an alphabetical basis. When the Council met in the gymnasium of Hunter College in New York for another meeting on March 25, Dr. Quo Tai-chi of China succeeded Makin as Chairman.

Seven basic permanent committees were set up by the General Assem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bly, and numerous others were constituted to fill various short-run functions. The seven committees, with their officers, are:

1. The General or Steering Committee—composed of the Assembly President, the seven Assembly Vice-Presidents, and the chairmen of the following committees:

2. Political and Security Committee—Chairman, D. Manuilsky Ukraine; Vice-Chairman, J. Bech, Luxembourg; Rapporteur, V. Lafronce, Ecuador.

3. Economic and Financial Council—Chairman, W. Konderski, Poland; Vice-Chairman, Dr. Pedro Lopez, Philippines; Rapporteur A. Perez del Castillo, Bolivia.

4. Social, Humanitariun and Cultural Committee—Chairman, Peter Fraser, New Zealand; Vice-Chairman, Miss Freida Dalen, Norway.

5. Trusteeship Committee — Chairman, Dr. Roberto Mac Eachen, Uruguay; Vice-Chairman, B. Tenelde, Ethiopia; Rapporteur, Ivan Kerno, Czechoslovakia.

6. Legal Committee—Chairman, Dr. Roberto Jimenez, Panama; Vice-Chairman, Dr. Per Federspiel Denmark.

7. Administrative and Budgetary Committee—Chairman, Fares el Khoury, Syria; Vice-Chairman, Vladimir Dadlar, Yugoslavia; Rapporteur, T. Aghnides, Greece.

Each of the above committees, except the General or Steering Committee, is composed of representatives of each of the 51 member states. Their officers, as is clear, give abundant representation to the smaller states.

In accordance with recommendations of the Assembly or the Preparatory Commission, there were established several commissions which will operate under the general supervision of the Economic and Social Council, as follows:

1. Commission on Human Rights.

2. Economic and Employment Commission.

3. Social Commission.

4. Statistical Commission. Nine experts were appointed to form a nuclear membership of each of these four commissions.

5. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, comprising the Big Five and 10 other nations, to carry on the work done hitherto by a League of Nations Committee in this field.

6. A Demographic Commission to study population questions.

7. A Temporary Transport and Communications Commission.

8. A Fiscal Commission.

9. A Commission to study the problem of refugees and displaced persons as recommended by the General Assembly.

10. Several negotiating committees to study methods for bringing the International Labor Office, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Bank and Monetary Fund and U.N.E.S.C.O. (United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization formed in the preceding November) into relationship with the U.N.O. as governmental agencies; also committees to bring the World Federation of Trade Unions, the American Federation of Labor and the International Cooperative Alliance into relation with U.N.O. as non-governmental advisory agencies.

This last question brought a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sharp conflict between the Soviet Union and many delegates of the western nations. The W.E.T.U. includes the C.I.O. but not the A.F.L. It claims to represent 60,000,000 workers, and therefore, said D. Manuilsky of the Ukraine, should alone be recognized. But Senator Tom Connally vigorously objected that the Ukrainian delegate was trying to "kick the A.F.L. into the gutter," and thumped the table to secure equal representation for the less radical American trade union organization. It seemed to some that Russia's purpose was to enable the W.E.T.U. to achieve a position such that, through its influence on many governments, it could dominate the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

Similarly the refugee and displaced persons proposal sharply divided the Assembly. Member states which did not believe in free political thinking and talking sought a right to purge the refugee camps of unfriendly political thinking and compel nationals to return, against their will, to their country of origin. This concerned particularly nearly a million refugees from Poland, the Baltic States and Yugoslavia who do not wish to come again under communist regimes. Other states, however, spoke up vigorously in favor of tolerance, freedom of political belief and the right of persons to choose their home. This led to one of the most dramatic moments in the Assembly discussions. Mrs. Roosevelt, with moving simplicity, pleaded for tolerance, while Mr. Vishinsky, with the explosive power of a great prosecutor, denounced tolerance as a dangerous weakness.

On the other hand, the proposal for the creation of an atomic energy control commission, already agreed upon by the Big Three at Moscow in December, 1945, met little opposition. It will meet in April or May in this country to work out one of the world's most difficult problems.

SECRETARY GENERAL

One of the most important men in the U.N.O. is the Secretary General. He heads the Secretariat, and functions as chief administrative officer of the U.N.O. at all meetings of the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. He is elected by the Assembly upon recommendation by the Security Council. Great Britain and the United States had been supporting Lester B. Pearson, Canadian Ambassador to Washington, for the position against Russian candidates from eastern Europe. But it was argued that it was giving too much to the Western Hemisphere if the Secretary General should be a Canadian in addition to having the headquarters in or near New York. After considerable maneuvering behind the scenes, Mr. Trygve Lie of Norway, who had been backed unsuccessfully by Russia for the job of Assembly President, was accepted as a compromise candidate agreeable to the Big Five, and duly elected.

Mr. Lie (pronounced Lee) is a stocky 50-year-old Norwegian labor lawyer with a recognized talent for negotiating. The son of a carpen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ter, he had no background in international diplomacy when he became Norwegian Foreign Minister in 1941. He is intensely energetic and works hard, and his friends say he never seems to tire or to lose his knack of inspiring colleagues.

Mr. Lie will be assisted as legal counsellor by Mr. Abraham H. Feller, a young New York lawyer of wide and varied experience.

INTERNATIONAL COURT

Another important institution established at London to take the place of the old World Court of 1919 was the new U.N.O. International Court of Justice. In four complicated ballots by the Assembly and the Security Council, voting independently but concurrently, 15 judges were elected from 72 candidates proposed. They included Judge Green H. Hackworth, hitherto legal advisor in the United States State Department; Hsu Mo of China; Carles de Visscher of Belgium; Jules Basdevant of France; J.G. Guerrero of El Salvador, last president of the old court; Sir Arnold D. McNair of Great Britain; Sergei B. Krylov of the Soviet Union; F. Alfaro of Mexico; A. Alvarez of Chile; J. P. de Barros of Brazil; Abdul Hamid Badawi Pasha of Egypt; John M. Read of Canada; M. Zoricitch of Yugoslavia; Helge Klaestad of Norway; and B. Winarski of Poland.

They will enjoy a salary of about $21,000 and will assemble for their first session this summer in the quarters of the old court at the Hague. The court will choose its own President, but the Secretary General will determine by lot which of the judges elected will serve for three, six or nine years. Elections hereafter will be for the regular term of nine years. One case has already been referred to the Court—the nearly century-old dispute between Britain and Guatemala over the boundary between British Honduras and Guatemala.

THE SECURITY COUNCIL

It had been anticipated that little would be undertaken at London beyond the necessary but comparatively prosaic organizational work outlined above, and the activity of the Council of Foreign Ministers which sat at the same time across the street from the Assembly in an effort to draft a treaty with Italy. This latter body made slow progress, owing to Russia's determined insistence that she be given the trusteeship over Tripolitania, and owing to disputes about the settlement of the boundary between Italy and Yugoslavia in the Trieste area.

Suddenly, however, the Security Council, which had adopted no rules of procedure and was just getting organized, had thrust upon it for decision four most inflammable disputes. They involved cases in which foreign troops stood on the soil of countries against the will of considerable parts of the population. They were cases which were alleged to constitute threats to the peace and security of the world and consequently brought the Security Council into the limelight. The four disputes concerned Russian troops in Iran, British troops in Greece and in Indonesia, and British and French troops in Syria and Lebanon.

These questions resulted in violent verbal clashes between Bevin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Vishinsky, with Stettinius and other delegates seeking to find compromise solutions which would not jeopardize the good relations of the Big Five and the dignity of the U.N.O. Whether the two protagonists acted wisely in venting their feelings so dramatically and in seriously rocking the boat barely launched, whether their frank speaking had a good effect in clearing the air, and whether the Security Council was well advised in accepting compromise solutions instead of letting the questions come to a show-down, are matters in which opinions differ. The writer is inclined to think that on the whole the frank speaking had a good effect in letting the public hear and form their own opinions on the facts and allegations. Furthermore, it was noted that after Bevin and Vishinsky, sitting side by side at the Security Council table, had heatedly berated one another and condemned the other's government actions, they did not appear to harbor lasting personal animus. After the meetings they shook hands or were seen walking with arms around one another and with drinks in their hands. Also it was recognized that some of Vishinsky's vehemence and insistent demands were for home consumption in Russia.

AZERBAIJAN

After British, American and Soviet troops entered Iran to convoy and protect lend-lease supplies moving from the Persian Gulf to Russia, a British-Soviet-Iranian treaty of 1942 promised that Iranian independence would be respected and the troops withdraw within six months after the end of the war with the Axis Powers, i.e. by March 2, 1946. There are rich deposits of oil in northern Iran. Concessions to work these had been sought by Soviet, British and American interests, but Iran refused to grant concessions during the war, and the British and Americans withdrew their requests. In 1945 a "democratic" (Communist) revolt against the Teheran Government broke out in Azerbaijan, an Iranian province bordering on the Soviet frontier. It was alleged that the revolt was fostered by the Russian troops, and there were suspicions that the Soviet Union was preparing to annex the province. Russian troops stopped loyal Iranian troops from marching to suppress the revolt. Numerous Iranian protests to Moscow brought no satisfactory reply or no answer at all.

Accordingly, as a last resort, Iran appealed on January 15, 1946, to the Security Council in London. It is now known that British and several other powers tried to dissuade the Iranian from making the appeal, fearing it would disturb the harmony of the first U.N.O. General Assembly meeting. The United States, however, rather encouraged the appeal as a healthy demonstration of the right of a small weak nation to seek help from the Security Council against an aggressive Great Power. The Soviet Union, however, suspected that Britain had instigated the appeal to protect its position in the Middle East, and quickly retaliated by verbal attacks on Britain's action in using troops in Greece, Indonesia and Syria and Lebanon.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After several days of hot argument, charges and counter-charges between the Russian and Iranians, and the reaction of various conciliatory proposals made by the other powers, the Security Council finally reached a unanimous compromise solution. Russia and Iran were invited to resume direct negotiations in the near future, but the Council retained the right to request information on the progress of the talks and to pass judgment on the results achieved. Accordingly the Iranians withdrew their appeal and sent their prime minister to Moscow to nego-

—Frank Williams in The Detroit Free Press

"SURE TO BE A FEW BUMPS"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tiate. He seems to have hoped that the Soviet Union would finally withdraw its troops on March 2, as promised. But on that date Russia announced that she was withdrawing only some of her troops, and the rest would remain until the situation was "elucidated." The Teheran government was still prevented by Russian troops from re-asserting its authority against the Azerbaijan rebels. The hoped-for solution by direct negotiations was therefore clearly unsatisfactory, and the question has again come before the Security Council at its meeting in New York.

GREECE AND INDONESIA

British troops had entered Greece to preserve order, protect the existing regime, and assure fair and orderly elections in accordance with agreements made at Yalta. Russia had been several times invited to share in supervising the Greek elections but had always refused on the pretext that it would be interfering in the domestic affairs of an independent state, in reality, however, because she knew she would be in a minority position.

British troops entered Java at the request of General MacArthur to disarm and repatriate the Japanese there after Japan's surrender, since the Dutch had no immediate troops available for the job. This led to some fighting between the British and the Indonesian nationalists who refused to accept a restoration of Dutch rule and claimed independence.

In retaliation for the Iranian appeal, and to embarrass the British and to make propaganda for the Soviet Union as champion of oppressed colonial peoples, Vishinsky and Manuilsky, the Ukrainian delegate, brought the cases before the Security Council. In sharply worded attacks they charged that the British by keeping troops in Greece and Indonesia were committing crimes and endangering the peace and security of the world, and demanded that the troops be withdrawn. Mr. Bevin hotly repudiated the charges and demanded a clean-cut verdict from the Council as to the truth or falsity of the Russian charges. It soon appeared that Vishinsky stood alone. All the other nine members were against him. He therefore agreed not to press his charges as to Greece and to drop his demand for the withdrawal of British troops. Mr. Bevin agreed to drop his demand for a vote of unconditional acquittal on the charges made, and the Council then declared the Greek case closed. The compromise formula was explicitly based on the record of the case, and the record spoke for itself as a complete vindication of Britain's position. The Russians also failed to get a majority to support their charges in regard to Indonesia, and therefore dropped them, after failing even to get the appointment of a commission of inquiry.

Syria and Lebanon, two of the newest and smallest states, appealed to the Security Council to secure the immediate removal of French and British troops from their soil. These two Levantine states, formerly French mandates, had been recognized as independent during the war, but the French had delayed withdrawing their troops on various

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grounds. This led to fighting between the French and the Syrians, and British troops were invited in from Palestine to stop the fighting and restore order.

Mr. Bevin promptly announced that he would be happy and glad to recall the British troops at once. M. Bidault, the French Foreign Minister, followed with a similar statement, but added that it would first be necessary to make technical arrangements which he hoped could be done through speedy negotiations.

Mr. Stettinius then offered a resolution which took note of the record of facts; asserted the Council's general belief that there should be no unwanted troops on foreign soil in time of peace; and expressed the Council's confidence that the case could be safely remanded to the parties for negotiation. This appeared to be a prompt and happy solution of the case.

At this point, however, Vishinsky began a long and bitter indictment of the French and British. He wanted no such easy solution. Instead of being closed, the incident then blazed into two more days of intense and futile debate. He offered amendments to the American resolution which both France and Britain—and most members of the Council regarded as stinging and unwarranted rebukes. Mr. Makin, the chairman of the Security Council, then called for a vote. Vishinsky said that he too was ready for a vote, provided it was taken under the provisions of the Charter excluding votes by members of the Council who were parties to a dispute which threatened international peace and security.

Both Bevin and Bidault hotly protested that this was not "a dispute threatening international peace and security"; that, therefore, they were entitled to vote and that they could not accept Vishinsky's implication. However, they neatly announced that, upon their own responsibility, they would voluntarily abstain from voting. Vishinsky's amendment was voted down with no one in its favor except himself.

The American resolution was then given the seven affirmative votes required by the Charter for a majority, and Mr. Makin announced that it was carried. But he was mistaken. The Charter also required that these seven votes must include the concurring votes of the permanent members of the Council. This was the famous "veto" upon which the Russians had been so insistent at San Francisco. Vishinsky promptly challenged Mr. Makin's ruling, and the resolution was lost through the Russian "veto." But the situation was saved magnificently by Bevin and Bidault. They declared that they would voluntarily accept the resolution and abide by its terms as though it were the law of the Council.

CONCLUSIONS

Excellent work was done at London in developing U.N.O. machinery. But machinery is not enough. It must have the active support of public opinion throughout the world. Through United Nations Associations and through U.N.E.S.C.O., cultural ties and mutual understanding between nations must be constantly fostered. At London good progress was made in this work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of arousing public interest and in focussing public attention upon international problems.

With the exception of the Soviet representatives, the delegates at London showed a good spirit of cooperation and conciliation, and a genuine realization of the great need and the great opportunity to make the U.N.O. a more effective instrument than the old League of Nations. In addition to what has been said above, it should be noted that some progress was made toward establishing a colonial trusteeship system. Great Britain set the example by pledging herself to accept United Nations trusteeship for areas she holds under League of Nations mandates. Her example was quickly followed by Belgium, Australia and New Zealand, and, with some hesitation and reservations, by France. All of the colonial powers joined in a message from the Assembly to dependent peoples emphasizing the concern of the United Nations for their welfare and the intention to promote self-government, free institutions and, where appropriate, independence. In the way of full agreement on the trusteeship system, however, stood the Union of South Africa, which wants to retain former German Southwest Africa; Russia, which insists on her sole trusteeship for Tripolitania, and uncertainty as to United States intentions in regard to the islands in the Pacific captured from Japan.

It was demonstrated at London that small and weak nations can get a full and satisfactory hearing before the Security Council, and that the majority of this powerful body recognize the spirit of fair play. Soviet efforts to exploit it to its own advantage was the most serious feature of the situation. Soviet attacks on Britain in London, her aggressive stand in Azerbaijan, her demand for Tripolitania, her pressure upon Turkey for a privileged position on the Dardanelles, look like efforts to challenge Britain's position in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. If the Soviet Union were successful in this, it would be like a knife drawn across the throat of the British Empire, and Mr. Bevin naturally does not want to allow it. Stalin's recent speeches praising the Red Army and insisting that Russia must make herself ever more powerful by embarking on new five-year plans have ominous implications.

The U.N.O. can function successfully only if Russia cooperates. How is this cooperation to be secured? Probably by a firmer attitude by the United States toward the Soviet Union and stronger insistence on respect for U.N.O. principles and machinery. Russia feels strong in her new youth as a great power and will try to get as much for herself as she can. But she seems to respect firmness in others and gives way when she cannot carry her point. At London Mr. Vishinsky, after verbal invective partly intended for home consumption, backed down every time when he found he was beaten.

• **Punctuality: The art of guessing correctly how late the other party is going to be.**

—National Rooster

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drug addiction greatest in post-war period

Poppies in Politics

By S. F. Welty

IN the past half century, every war, both in the United States and abroad, has been followed by the spread of drug addiction. Not only has the United States made every effort to forestall such an aftermath of World War II, but in conjunction with others of the United Nations it is doing much to stop the international drug traffic at its source. If international drug controls already set up can be strengthened in the next few months, drug addiction may become an increasingly minor social problem in all the cooperating countries.

Amid all the war-time confusion, the United States led its allies both in trying to keep previously arranged international controls functioning, and in planning new and stricter post-war regulation.

A pleasant and immediate by-product of victory over Japan is the elimination of the greatest illicit drug trafficker in the world—the Japanese government. Since 1931 Japan has been forcing opium culture and the use of opium on the conquered people of Manchukuo and occupied China, making them unfit for organized revolt or self-government and securing from them a tremendous revenue. Japan also encouraged dope peddling to the rest of the world in huge quantities. In 1942 she was responsible for about 90 per cent of all the illicit "white drugs" of the world, according to Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger, Chief of the United States Bureau of Narcotics, who said, "Japan's aggressive dope-spreading policy is as definite as her military aggression." But one of the Allied Occupation Command's earliest directives in Tokyo made that a thing of the past. On November 18, 1945, General MacArthur's order forbade all future planting and cultivation of narcotics plants, and ordered the destruction of crops already planted. All exportation of hashish, cocaine, opium and opium derivatives was banned. Since Japan's two chief producers turned out in 1944 the equivalent of 30 years' legitimate world supply of narcotics, the stream of illicit drugs should now dry up considerably.

Opium has played a role in international politics before, in a way little more creditable to the West than its recent use by Japan. The "Opium War" of 1839-1842, between China and Great Britain, and the "Opium War" of 1856-1858, with France allied to Great Britain against China, were partly fought to force the unwilling Chinese government to legalize the profitable opium traffic. Though opium was forced on China at that time, China in 1906 had a government strong

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough to attempt its suppression. By agreement with India, from which came much of the opium used in China, both governments attempted to reduce poppy growing and opium trade. Great Britain thus made partial amends for earlier injustice. By 1917 China had gone far toward freeing herself of opium; then political upheavals removed effective controls. Chiang Kai-shek's government in 1935 instituted a six year plan for the suppression of opium, and reduced opium cultivation and smoking to a minimum in its own territory. But the Japanese policy in occupied provinces created about thirty million new addicts. The Chinese government, on coming back into control, began at once to confiscate and burn stores of opium. It ordered the destruction of poppy fields and forebade further cultivation. In a great new drive against drug addiction, it has decreed that a poppy grower or opium salesman, or a pill-smoker who is a third time offender, may be punished by death.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL

Other nations long ago realized that the opium problem is not China's alone. When the United States took the Philippines, it inherited an opium monopoly which it abolished. In 1909 President Theodore Roosevelt proposed an international opium investigation, and a conference met that year at Shanghai with 13 nations represented. Recommendations from that meeting were embodied in the first Opium Convention, drawn up at the Hague in 1912. International control and limitation of dangerous drugs, but without international supervisory machinery, went forward until World War I. After that, the League of Nations Covenant provided that members would "entrust the League with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regards to . . . the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs." Under this provision, four treaties and two agreements were made during the next 20 years. Sixty-seven nations, excluding only Argentina and Ethiopia, signed one or more. Japan deliberately violated the two she signed. The agreements are all still legally in force.

The first international body formed to deal with the problem was the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs, appointed by the League Council in 1921. It suggests policies and generally supervises the application of existing conventions. The Central Opium Board was created in 1925 to oversee an international accounting system in drug imports and exports; and the Drug Supervisory Body in 1931 to determine the quantity of drugs which a power signing the 1931 Limitation Convention is entitled to manufacture.

The United States, though never a League of Nations member, has always cooperated fully with the League's work on narcotics, through these international drug control commissions. In 1940 the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Drug Supervisory Body moved from their headquarters in Geneva to branch offices in Washington, D.C. They have worked steadily

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through the war years. Both prepared to cooperate in drug control as the United Nations re-occupied and conquered countries: their work began almost with D-Day in Europe.

Opium poppies are the common "garden poppies" of Central Europe today—grown in kitchen gardens for their edible seeds. Before this war, poppy seeds imported into the United States came chiefly from the Netherlands and Poland for culinary purposes. United States medicinal opium, in the 10 years before the war, came mostly from Turkey, somewhat less from Yugoslavia, and in small amounts from Persia (Iran), Bulgaria, Afghanistan and Greece. The opium poppy was probably introduced into China about 650 A.D., but did not present a social problem there until about 1650. The plant will grow, and has been grown, almost everywhere, including many parts of the United States.

Legal opium is usually commercially profitable only where cheap human labor is available, because it requires the incising of each poppy seedpod to collect the milky juice from which opium is made. Opium poppies have seldom been grown in this country except in home gardens for flowers or seeds. The flowers are beautiful; up to 1942 American seedsmen carried them as "Tall Annual Poppies" for garden ornament. *Papaver somniferum,* the opium poppy, grows to three or four feet in height, with showy flowers four or five inches across. Some of these are single, some double; some have fringed petals and some plain; some are white, others all tints and shades to red and dark violet. But they all have the same ability to produce morphine, and they will all soon be unknown in American gardens, since the Opium Poppy Control Act of 1942 forbids any domestic production of the opium poppy except under license in case it should be necessary to produce medical supplies of opium. "Oriental" poppies are not opium poppies, and do not produce opium.

The war having cut off ordinary imports of poppy and sesame seed, several California farmers in 1944 planted about 2000 acres of poppies to supply the demand of bakeries. A good acre's crop would have grossed about $675 under prevailing prices. Narcotics agents, however, persuaded the owners of about 1500 acres to destroy their plantings. The seven farmers owning the other 500 acres refused on the ground that the Opium Control Act was unconstitutional. By the time the Act was upheld in federal court, the seeds had mildewed and charges against the farmers were dismissed. Opium poppy culture, even for seeds, is now "out" in this country. Before 1942 many good Americans, notably those of Czech extraction, commonly grew opium poppies for seed in their kitchen gardens, probably without knowing that their plants could produce opium. The law, therefore, necessitated some popular education.

The United States has come close to solving its domestic drug problem through the Treasury Department with its effective Narcotic Bureau, but even the United States could not achieve such a result without cooperation. This was demonstrated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in April, 1945, when Mexican troops were called out in northwest Mexico to stop the harvest of opium from poppies grown in out-of-the-way areas. Aided by United States Treasury Department detectives, they arrested several growers and rooted up fields of illegal poppies. Mexican cooperation is advantageous; a pound of pure opium used to bring about $75 in the American underworld; now it brings about $700. With such profits to tempt producers, the most watchful governments can hardly control production. Fortunately effective border patrols and vigilant customs officers keep out most smugglers' stock.

Thus United States citizens at home are protected, but what about the thousands of soldiers abroad in opium-using countries? Protective measures have been taken by Army and Bureau of Narcotics officials in North Africa, Iran and India. Other nations have been equally concerned. In April, 1944, the Permanent Central Opium Board met in London to plan for dealing with narcotics in enemy territories as soon as they were occupied. The British and Dutch governments have declared that they will suppress opium smoking in their Far Eastern colonial empires as soon as their control is re-established.

In June, 1944, Congress passed the Judd resolution requesting the State department to urge all opium-producing nations to limit opium growth and production to the medicinal and scientific needs of the world. First major result of this international plea came from Afghanistan, which in November announced that it would hereafter prohibit the growing of opium poppies in its territory. This augurs well for the future, since Afghanistan has lately been a considerable producer, and by this action relinquishes her share in the legitimate opium trade which she might have claimed. Iran is now the one nation which has consistently refused to accept international obligations limiting its freedom to sell opium to all buyers, and is known as the source of a large quantity of illicit drugs.

If the new world organization of the United States finds the present international drug control machinery too intimately bound up with the old League of Nations to survive the League's final dissolution, it will certainly devise new controls for traffic in dangerous drugs. These would take months or years to institute. It will be fortunate if existing controls can be used and strengthened, for the immediate post-war period is the time when danger is greatest that drug addiction will spread.

•An English prisoner-of-war repatriated via Odessa tells a story of meeting a Russian officer who spoke perfect English. So proud, indeed, was the Russian of his English that he kept correcting the Englishman's native speech.

At last the Englishman got fed up and said, "All right, I may be wrong. But you are talking capitalist English—I talk worker's English."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Revision of colonial structure may make a strong France

French Problems of Empire

By Ernest J. Knapton

Professor of History, Wheaton College

FRANCE, no less than Great Britain or the Netherlands, is deeply concerned with problems of empire. The second largest of the world's colonial powers, with her possessions washed by the seven seas, she is exposed to all the stresses and strains which accompany the historic "white man's burden." She is not likely to find an easy solution to her problems.

The soldier, the saint, the martyr, the merchant, the administrator and the adventurer have all played their part in the growth of the French Empire. France's possessions have been a source both of strength and weakness. In her hour of crisis some colonies rallied to the side of General de Gaulle; others gave their allegiance to Pétain; others sought to free themselves from their former ties. The French Empire has seen the rise of distinguished figures such as Lyautey and Eboué—devoted servants of their country and also believers in the people whom they governed. It has also seen leaders of protest and dissent—none so spectacular as the Gandhi's and Nehru's of India, but nevertheless men prepared to challenge the authority of the tricolor.

Frenchmen may well remember that before the French Revolution of 1789 a Society of Friends of the Negroes was founded in France, that the slave-trade was abolished in 1818 and slavery itself in 1848, that natives have shared in colonial administration, and that members of the colored races have sat in the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate. At least three have held cabinet posts; others have risen high in the colonial service; one of them, Felix Eboué, has served brilliantly as Governor-General of Equatorial Africa.

This Empire is an exceedingly complex structure. Many parts have been administered directly by the Ministry of Colonies under governors sent out from France and have enjoyed varying degrees of local autonomy. Morocco and Tunisia are protectorates and a connection with France through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Indo-Chinese Union is a complex affair which includes both protectorates and colonies and which recognizes in one of its component parts (Annam) a ruler with the title of emperor. Algeria has a unique status, being divided into three departments similar to those of Metropolitan France and thus coming under the general supervision of the Ministry of the Interior. It cannot, however, be regarded as an integral part of France.

Syria and the Lebanon, until recently French mandates, are now

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recognized as members of the United Nations, while the other French mandates of Togoland and the Cameroons have been given a guarded promise that they may be considered as eligible for trusteeship status under the new provisions of the United Nations Charter. French West and Equatorial Africa, French Guiana, the French West Indies, French Somaliland, Madagascar, the New Hebrides and New Caledonia add to the great network of French possessions. It is not always remembered that the old French trading posts along the coast of India have a population of 300,000, or that French fishermen may find a haven under the French flag on the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

FRENCH ADMINISTRATION

Contrary to the decentralized system of British imperial administration, French policy has sought to provide direct representation for many of her colonies in the French Parliament. St. Pierre, Miquelon and Martinique, Guadeloupe, Guiana, French India, Réunion and the Algerian departments all have had their deputies and senators. Indo-China has sent deputies but no senators. All the colonies have been represented on the advisory Conseil Supérieur des Colonies at Paris.

The administration of French colonial possessions has traditionally been marked by a guiding theory variously described as "assimilation" or "association." This emphasizes the idea of the unity of France with her overseas possessions. The colonies have served to complement the French economy and to add to the military strength of the mother country. As one experienced French administrator has written:

> Following the tradition of 1789, every Frenchman was disposed to share with all colonized peoples the institutions he enjoyed himself. He considered that his highest moral duty was to transform Africans, Malagaches and Tonkinese into French citizens as rapidly as possible and to duplicate for them the political conditions of Metropolitan France. . . . Frenchmen are proud of this reputation as "assimilators"; and it was precisely because they were proud of their democratic institutions that they wished to share them.

From this policy has followed the tendency to regard the Empire as the real source of French strength. An interesting illustration of this may be seen at the time of the Munich crisis of 1938. The system of continental alliances which France had build up after 1919 and on which she had traditionally relied was being challenged by the power of a resurgent and aggressive Germany. Should France seek at all costs to maintain her eastern European alliances and continue to be "the gendarme of Europe"? Georges Bonnet, the French Foreign Minister, and a good many others thought not. France should face a new situation and, above all, nurse and protect her colonial interests. "Her security," wrote *Le Matin*, "does not lie on the Danube, the Vistula, or the Bosphorus. It is along the Vosges, the Alps, the Pyrenees, and the Atlas Mountains. There she must concentrate her efforts .... France has two capitals:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paris and Algiers." But the advocates of this new course could not contrive the means to save France from catastrophe.

After the débacle of 1940, parts of the French Empire soon began to play an important part in the movement of resistance headed by General de Gaulle. The New Hebrides were rallied to him in July, the Chad in August, New Caledonia in September, and French Equatorial Africa in November. A Defense Council of the French Empire was established in October, 1940, serving as a forerunner of the Free French National Committee set up in the following year. Syria and the Lebanon were won back from Vichy by the combined British and Free French campaign of the summer of 1941, thus forestalling a German thrust to the East; Madagascar was invaded in May, 1942; the assault on North Africa was undertaken in the following November. The eventual establishment of the French Committee of National Liberation in Algiers served to underline the importance of the Empire in France's struggle for liberation. On the other hand, French Indo-China, where the Vichy regime had steadily yielded to Japanese infiltration, came openly into the hands of the enemy.

In this complex Empire certain facts stand out. France herself has a population of less than forty millions; her overseas possessions amount to some sixty-seven millions, with nearly twenty-five millions in Asia and over forty-one in Africa. Can French statesmanship so contrive to organize and maintain the weight of "France Overseas" as to compensate for France's relative weakness in the European balance? Can it draw advantage from the fact that under the French flag lie certain points or areas of tremendous strategic importance: Dakar, Nouméa, Martinique, Cam-ranh Bay or the vital air route passing through Equatorial Africa to the Sudan?

When victory was won the French were confronted with problems of the utmost complexity and difficulty. No one could doubt that a great housecleaning was needed at home. To what extent were reforms needed overseas? One point seemed clear. French spokesmen had repeatedly expressed their determination that not one foot of French soil should be lost. The Empire might be reconstituted but, in their eyes, it could not be surrendered.

To this view Syria and the Lebanon might seem an exception. But these territories were never in any true sense French; they were mandates administered under the League of Nations, unhappy in their status, torn by armed conflict, and frequently but vainly promised their independence. At long last this independence has been realized. An Anglo-French agreement of December, 1945, has announced the imminent withdrawal of the remaining garrisons. France can have little hope of a treaty which would give her concessions of the kind that Britain has enjoyed in Egypt or Iraq. She may hope to maintain her cultural interests in this area—she is reported to have been spending nearly two million dollars there yearly and maintains some five

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hundred schools. But beyond that her cause in Syria and the Lebanon is a lost one.

Indo-China, which a former Minister of Colonies once described as "from every point of view the most important, the most developed and the most prosperous of our colonies," is now a trouble center in French colonial policy. In the past it has been a highly profitable area for French investors. In 1938, for example, over 95 per cent of the foreign invested capital was French, with an average return over a period of four years calculated at 7 per cent. Little had been done in the way of the recognition of native rights. While under Vichy rule, a League for the Independence of Indo-China was organized with a program looking to the creation of a democratic assembly and the inauguration of economic, educational and social reforms. The De Gaullist Provisional Government was quick to promise Indo-China "a new political status within the French community" but the close of the Japanese war has been followed by risings directed to the goal of complete independence.

British troops in the south and Chinese troops in the north have, with some French assistance, reestablished a measure of order, and agreements have been made permitting French administrators to take over. But the nationalist agitation continues and reports have been made to the effect that the French local authorities are now using ruthless measures in an attempt to stamp out disaffection. It would seem that French rule in this area is still tinged with the spirit of "old-fashioned imperialism" and has aroused deep native resentment.

The problems of Indo-China, moreover, are much more than political. A very large measure of economic reform is needed. The prevailing economy, based upon rice culture, but supplemented by other crops and by an important mineral output, has left a great many natives impoverished. Peasant holdings usually are wretchedly small. A program of agrarian reform is urgently needed, together with some degree of industrialization. Large amounts of foreign capital will be required if this country is to avoid becoming what one student calls "a huge, stagnant backwater."

In North Africa the French have shown a readiness to consider the susceptibilities of their Moslem subjects. A dual system of French and Islamic law is in effect. By an ordinance of March, 1944, Moslems can gain French citizenship without having to renounce Koranic law, and those with special qualifications can acquire voting privileges. In the recently elected French Constituent Assembly 26 deputies were chosen from Algeria, of whom half were natives. It is to be remembered that of the 16,000,000 inhabitants of North Africa, only about one million are French.

The increased tenderness shown to Moslem susceptibilities may well be conditioned by the growing shadow of the Arab League in the Near East, for this latest move in the direction of Pan-Arabism is bound eventually to have a significant bearing upon France's position.

In the vast expanses of French West and Equatorial Africa the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most promising signs of a new policy can be seen. The changed attitude to the native problem which has grown up over the years can perhaps best be characterized by a remark made years ago by Marshal Lyautey of a French resident adviser: "He is very clever, but he will never achieve anything because he lacks that spark of love without which no great human enterprise can be accomplished." Lyautey's work in Morocco was certainly more than that of the soldier, but one must look to the policies of Felix Eboué in Equatorial Africa and more particularly to certain memoranda which he circulated among his subordinates for the elaboration of Lyautey's fundamental ideas.

Eboué was himself a native of French Guiana. In his view French policy could not be assimilation or integration. It must start by accepting the fact of the reality of the existing civilizations in the colonies. "From this truth," observes P. O. Lapie, former Governor of the Chad, "comes a colonial doctrine of inner progress patterned after nature, as opposed to the doctrine of assimilation with all that it entails of fabrication and artificiality." Eboué has stated the same principle:

> The basic approach for us Frenchmen, in our colonial policy, is a desire to recognize those traits in the natives that are common to all men. But the foundation on which this policy rests must be an understanding of the relation between such universality and the nature of things distinctively African—in other words, a perception of the inner differences to be found in men, in their degree of civilization, in their ancestral customs, in their traditional commandments. There can be no question of transforming a native of Central Africa into a Frenchman of Central France at one stroke.

It follows that there must be a large degree of decentralization, an acceptance of tribal patterns, and as far as possible a reliance on the authority of the local chiefs. The African, who has little sense of nationalism but who does have what has been described as "a simple, uncomplicated sense of racialism," must become a citizen of Africa rather than a citizen of France. For the exceptional native who is not satisfied with his usual environment a means must be provided so that he may rise without discrimination to any level.

Eboué is dead, but some of his ideas live on in French official policy. The drafting committee now at work on the new French constitution has proposed the following article: "Every individual dwelling legally within the French Union, including Metropolitan France as well as colonies, is admitted to the professions and private employment without any other limitation than that of his capacities, aptitudes, and talents." A significant landmark may be seen in the colonial conference held at Brazzaville, in Equatorial Africa, in February, 1944. Out of it have come certain recommendations endorsing the principles just described and indicating the lines along which the structure of the new French Federation may develop. In brief, the conference envisaged more colonial representation in the national government and more native representation in local government. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"assimilative" tendencies of the past should give place to the growth of the federal idea.

It may be significant of the trend that the old title of Minister of Colonies has now been changed to that of Minister for France Overseas. But it is to be noted that no French official has been prepared to accept what the British Parliament laid down in the Statute of Westminster, namely, the legal right of the members of the British Commonwealth to secede from that Commonwealth. One of the proposals of the Brazzaville conference was the creation of a federal assembly—a "Parliament d'Outre-Mer"—with elected representatives both from France and the colonies to deliberate simultaneously with the regular parliament of France.

Any system of imperialism as it exists in the world today must of necessity be influenced by the trusteeship plans of the United Nations Organization. France has already announced her willingness to place her African mandates (Togoland and the Cameroons) under the new system, though it is highly unlikely that she would be prepared to see anyone but herself in the role of a trustee. No more than any great power has she been willing to go beyond the limits of her present mandates in offering to put territories under the trusteeship council. Other lines of development are, of course, possible, particularly in respect to the question of regional federation. Both in Africa and in Asia French possessions have many problems which are similar to those in adjacent territories under other rule. The proposal of Lord Hailey, an experienced British administrator, that some sort of regional groupings be established for such areas with federal councils able at least to discuss matters of common concern, suggests a possible technique for diminishing those exclusive imperialistic policies that have so often been troublesome in the past.

WORLD INTERESTS

Other questions are bound to arise in consequence of the world interests of the great powers. American stategic policy may well lead to a request for a lease on such a base as Nouméa in New Caledonia. The air route across Equatorial Africa will surely be the subject of international concern. Above all, the economic development of many of France's possessions would seem to be a problem beyond her ability to solve alone. West Africa, the "neglected orphan" of France, and Indo-China are cases in point. Access to raw materials, a chance to invest capital and establish new industries and markets for manufactures are matters in which the United States, for example, must be closely interested. If the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organization lives up to the hopes of its proponents it will find many problems for it to tackle within the French orbit.

It is impossible to make any simple conclusion as to the French problems of empire. So much depends upon the vitality of France herself. Her own rehabilitation and reconstruction present a challenge of enormous proportions. That France must expect changes and disappoint-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments is certain. In Syria and the Lebanon, surely, one can see the end of a chapter. In Indo-China one may venture the guess that the nationalist movement will not easily be downed and that the future interests of this area will tend to lie more and more with its Asiatic neighbors.

France's older possessions in the West Indies and the Indian Ocean do not seem to present any immediate critical problems. Africa, it may be ventured, offers the greatest challenge to the best instincts and the worthiest traditions of the French colonial administrator. Here is an area where for many years to come the white man and the native may work side by side for their mutual good.

Imperialism is not dead. It is a living and potentially dangerous force in the world today. But there is the hope, and indeed the possibility, that some of its more sinister aspects may recede into the background as the system of trusteeships comes into operation and a new sense of responsibility develops. World federation seems a long way off, but the federal experiments which France may be able to try within the framework of her possessions may ultimately contribute something to that distant goal. In the long run the constructive effort that France may be able to put into the revision of her colonial structure will be of value not only in the making of a stronger France but in the establishment of a better world.

MORE TRUTH THAN POETRY

●Signs in store windows can fool you if you let them. Here are three from grocery store windows, guaranteed to stop the unwary customer in his tracks: "Try out A-L butter. No one can touch it." "Beef is high. Our prices are the same." "Don't go elsewhere to be cheated. Come here."

From an ice cream store window came this advice: "Take a brick home. Splendid for visitors." And from a department store, this: "A large stock of ladies' hose, pure silk, to be cleared at 89 cents a pair. They won't last long at this price."

If your head is still clear, here's one more—from a small but boastful dairy: "Try our milk. Cream ain't in it!"

—*The Santa Fe Magazine*

NEW TRICKS

●The Superintendent Emeritus of the Atlanta, Georgia, public schools once visited a school in his state where the mascot was a beloved hound dog. He was surprised to hear the mascot referred to as "Principal."

"Why do you call your mascot by that name?" he asked.

"Well, sir," a student explained. "He just weaves in and out of the rooms all day."

Several years later the superintendent returned to the same school and found the same hound dog. But now he was referred to as "Superintendent." He asked about the change of name.

"Oh", said a student, "He's pretty old now and doesn't get around much any more. We call him 'superintendent' because he just sits in one spot and howls all the time!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our press has made a shameful record

A Responsible Press?

By Oswald Garrison Villard

From his column in The Progressive

THE record of the American press during World War II and in the half year which has followed the end of hostilities is replete with sordid distortions of the truth. It is a record of shameful suppression, of too easy acquiescence in censorship, of apologizing and covering up for the mistakes of the military, of fanning hatreds against whole peoples even when the war was over, and of miserable incompetence and inadequacy in reporting the occupation of conquered countries and the struggle for freedom in colonial areas.

Neither the military censorship nor the government is wholly to blame for the lengths to which the American press has gone in the unprecedented campaign of hate and the spreading of atrocity stories under big headlines. The writer of this article would be the last to wish to suppress the horrors of Dachau and Buchenwald—indeed he was bringing them to public attention in *The Nation* very soon after those fiendish places were established, when it was almost impossible to get the daily newspapers interested in them.

It was obvious that General Eisenhower did just the right thing in having proofs of this unparalled barbarism photographed and shown to the high-ranking German prisoners and to as many other Germans as possible. But our press has dwelt so continuously on these stories as to achieve what seemed to many its deliberate purpose of making Americans think that most of the victims of the horror camps were Americans, and that our men in German prison camps were starved and maltreated in accordance with a general policy of the German government. An interesting example of this was afforded when the American Red Cross reported officially that "99 per cent of the American prisoners of war in Germany have survived and are on their way home"—a remarkable record for the best of prison camps and one vastly superior to the ghastly showing of our prison stockades North and South during the Civil War.

This extraordinary showing was made when we were bombing German supply and communication lines and millions of homeless civilians were roaming around the country. It was not allowed, however, to make any impression upon our public. Thus, the dispatch reporting it appeared under these headlines in the *Herald-Tribune* which "buried" the statement as to the safety of our prisoners under the Hitler item:

HITLER ORDERED U.S. AND BRITISH FLIERS KILLED

But The Army Refused, Says The

© 1946, by The Progressive, Madison, Wisconsin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Red Cross, Because Allies Followed Geneva Rules.

No dispatch more clearly belonged on the first page of our newspapers, for none could possibly have meant so much re-assurance and encouragement to the children, parents, and wives of the many thousand American prisoners within the German lines. I have yet to meet any one who read this dispatch and only one or two who had seen the official statement of Provost Marshal General Archer L. Lerch that, while some individual German camp commanders were violating orders and mistreating American prisoners, he was "convinced that in general the Nazi Government was trying to treat Americans with strict if not generous legality."

What was the New York *World-Telegram's* top headline on this story? Here it is: "Are We Coddling Prisoners?" It is only fair to add, however, that the second headline, bigger and blacker, read: "Army Blames German Crackup for Mistreatment of Yanks"—also quite misleading. But it, too, was not front page stuff. Nor, so far as I am aware, were there any editorial comments upon these two official testimonies that, with defeat overwhelming them, and their country literally collapsing about them, the Germans made an honest effort to treat our prisoners decently, while ill-treating and murdering by wholesale the Jews, the civilian "slaves" and military prisoners of other nationalities.

Nor have I seen any denial on this side of the Atlantic of the charge made by Allan Wood, a front correspondent of the London *Express,* that "the most amazing thing about the atrocities in this war is that there have been so few of them. I have come up against few instances where the Germans have not treated our prisoners according to the rules, and respected the Red Cross.

"I have seen much of the way in which human chivalry is kept alive amid all the sickening bestialities of war; though, of course, I have rarely been permitted to mention the chivalry when it was on the German side. . . And even if the censor does not object, the newspapers exert their right, under our system of a free press, to suppress anything which contradicts their policy."

His last statement is, of course, true of newspapers everywhere. Certainly our press could not find time or place to record a remarkable piece of cooperation between an American and a German surgical team during the December breakthrough of the Germans when they operated side by side on German and American wounded alike, with the battle going on around them. Nor has our press reported that the records show that the German surgeons did their best, with limited and decreasing means when our wounded fell into their hands. Its duty was plainly to create hate and ill-will—not to hold the scales even and report objectively.

Again, our newspapers have unitedly taught the American people that the Germans had our obliteration bombing "coming to them" because they "began it." Not a daily has, I believe, brought out the fact that an English official, J. M.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spaight, formerly the "Principal Assistant Secretary of the Air Ministry," published in 1944 a book called *Bombing Vindicated* which not only declares that England began the "strategic" bombing of Germany *before* Germany bombed England, but that the English should be proud of having done so. Mr. Spaight writes:

"Because we were doubtful about the psychological effect of propagandist distortion of the truth that it was we who started the strategic bombing offensive, we have shrunk from giving our great decision of May, 1940, the publicity which it deserved. That surely was a mistake. It was a splendid decision. It was as heroic, as self-sacrificing, as Russia's decision to adopt her policy of "scorched earth." It gave Coventry and Birmingham, Sheffield and Southhampton, the right to look Kiev and Kharkov, Stalingrad and Sevastopol, in the face. Our Soviet allies would have been less critical of our inactivity in 1942 if they had understood what we had done."

Since this book was published by a former official who was legally bound not to reveal government secrets without permission, and had passed the strict British censorship, it cannot be asserted that it was the idle allegation of a minor office-holder. But not one of the great corps of American correspondents in London cabled this sensational charge.

Throughout the obliteration bombing our press helped the Government to maintain the lie that we were only doing "precision bombing." As late as February 22, 1945, the Associated Press carried Secretary Stimson's official statement that it was absolutely false to say that we were doing any obliteration bombing whatsoever. Twelve days later March 6, the United Press reported from London that "more than 1,100 R.A.F. planes bombed Germany last night, most hitting the key railway and defense hub of Chemnitz in an obliteration raid . . . Though Chemnitz has been bombed repeatedly by Allied air armadas, including an American formation, the new attack was ordered because the city was still not devastated to the extent of smoldering Dresden (!) the Ministry said."

Obviously this gave the lie direct to Secretary Stimson. Who cared? Not the press, which had rallied as one man to denounce some 18 clergymen and publicists who protested against this obliteration bombing as contrary to all laws of war and the decencies of humanity.

Pages could be filled with the deliberate misrepresentations of war events by order of the military. Thus, when our great bombing raid upon Schweinfurt turned out to be a disaster, the press helped the Allied governments to lie about it, even though the enemy knew exactly what had happened. In fact the German statement of fully 100 planes shot down has recently been borne out by the admission that the American Air Chief called in the reporters after the raid and admitted the losses were staggering. He said that it could not be printed because that would injure the morale of our fliers—just as if our surviving airmen did not know that many more than the 60 bombers, which the Air Chief insisted should be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

printed as missing, had not returned.

The result was, therefore, only to fool the American people. Similarly, the first raid over Ploesti in Rumania was wholly misrepresented. Surely united action by the press would have compelled the airforce and the administration to stop this useless lying. The newspapers also spread abroad the Churchill falsehood that the outcome of the Dieppe raid was quite satisfactory, coupling this with misrepresentation of the losses, every detail of which the enemy well knew since he possessed the dead and the prisoners.

I have seen in no American daily so horrible a picture of the Russian atrocities in Danzig and East Prussia as has been published by F. A. Voigt, the outspoken editor of the London *Nineteenth Century and After* in his issue of November, 1945, based upon 17 statements by eyewitnesses of what happened in Danzig, and detailed reports by two British officers, and one from a British officer who toured the Sudetenland in September, plus numerous reports by clergy, doctors, and others who witnessed this fearful hegira. In fact I doubt if any reader of the American newspapers anywhere has the faintest idea that Danzig was destroyed down to the last building, and that the women were raped, sometimes 30 and 40 times, by the drunken Russian soldiery.

If, as most observers believe, we had one of the most dreadful winters in modern history, with millions condemned to die from cold and starvation and this comes as a surprise to the American people when it happens, the fault will be with our dailies, with some fine exceptions, like the New York *Times*, which recently gave the bulk of two pages to portraying conditions all over Europe.

Even then, however, it did not give a true picture of the existing sufferings and wholesale deaths. When Ernest Bevin, the British Foreign Minister, told the Commons what he had seen in a railroad station in Berlin as he watched the trains bringing the dead and dying people from Poland who have been guiltless of any hostility to either Russians or anyone else, he said: "As I watched, I felt, my God, that is the price of man's stupidity and war. It was the most awful sight you could possibly see". Yet in New York, the *Times* alone featured the story as it should have been featured. Beyond its readership few people, I venture to assert, have the slightest knowledge of this extraordinary debate in the House of Commons in which its members upheld the British Government in its determination to do everything possible to succor the Germans who but a few months ago were seeking to destroy the greatest of cities and the British people.

What it all comes down to is whether the press, even in wartime, has or has not a transcending duty to its readers and to its country to interpret objectively from beginning to end, to consider itself as being charged with the final responsibility for the truth and for that freedom of utterance which the press usually demands, and for the preservation of American institutions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Extinction of the "Golden Age" by the Sunday Supplement

Halley's Threat

By Robert L. Wheeler

From his column in the Providence Evening Bulletin

THE speculative field-day which is now being had all over the place with regard to the chances of atomic energy getting out of hand and making a grand slam of everything reminds me of the year 1910, when the world was being destroyed regularly once a week by Sunday supplement.

In case you have forgotten or were not yet born, 1910 was the year in which Halley's Comet made its last appearance. Its next one is scheduled for 1986 but don't expect me to wait around for it. I don't want to have to live through another End of the World, with illustrations by newspaper artists.

It was a peaceful, idyllic universe which Halley's Comet invaded and one which now seems long ago and far away, like something imagined by the Brothers Grimm. The only part of it which mattered much was firmly controlled by a sound Republican administration. Geography was something children studied in a schoolroom and not through a bomb-sight and the moon was for lovers to sit under and not for the army to bounce radar off. All us kids knew about war was Grandpa Breslin getting drunk on Memorial Day and trying to explain Chancellorsville to somebody who didn't want to listen.

Most of the aids to comfortable living which now bedevil us had either not been invented or were in their horrible infancy.

Into this practically Golden Age buzzed Halley's Comet a-whooshing and a-whizzing and a-cutting of its perihelion. And editors who hadn't really had much to do since the Spaniards surrendered hopped promptly aboard it and set their two-headed calf departments to work devising layouts, which always included some artist's depiction of the fearful scenes which would ensue whenas and whenif a comet, either Halley's or somebody else's, ever hit us right smack in the puss.

This standard Sunday supplement illustration was really something, and I think I can see it now. It showed a huge meteorite hitting a street-car kerblam and people fleeing in panic without paying their fares, and with their mouths open, too. It made a profound impression upon my youthful mind and I am able to recall it at will on my nightly ride home on the crack 5:45 trolley, the Creeping Jeepers. It is a comfort to me to reflect that no meteorite could ever hit anything going at such a blinding speed, or change the expression on the faces of some of my fellow-passengers if it did.

Above the depiction of Doomsday there would be an old cut of the Three Wise Men looking at the Star of Bethlehem and a scholarly

 ©1946, by the Providence Evening Bulletin, Providence, Rhode Island

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if blasphemous discussion in blackface type of the possibility of its having been Halley's Comet. There would also be pictures of observatories and telescopes and an inset cut of Professor Hootentooten, the great pseudo-scientist and barfly, figuring the odds in favor of a comet hitting Cincinnati.

In the article which meandered through this double-truck layout of pictorial bilge Professor Hootentooten was quoted as having stated, warningly, that just because the warhead of Halley's Comet wasn't going to come anywhere near us, we were not to be so foolish as to be deluded into believing that no danger boded.

Did the public not realize that sometime during the summer the Earth was scheduled to pass through the Comet's fearsome Tail? Ah-ha!

At this point Professor Hootentooten would reach for the bottle and begin to tell about the Tail of Halley's Comet.

He said he had reason to believe that it was composed of poisonous and searing gases which would make a good clean job of the human race, after turning it green. So depressed was I by the findings of Professor Hootentooten and other Sunday supplement scientists that I neglected to practice my outcurves for days. What was the use of mowing down East Apex High with it if I couldn't bend it past Halley's Comet?

It was a lovely Spring drenched with apple blossoms and Pete Ray was butchering a pig at the slaughter house up by Hoxsie's Bridge but I lacked the heart to skip school. I figured I might as well stay where I was on the chance that the Comet's Tail would be a little early and maybe catch men in the Principal's office. I wanted to be with him at the end.

I got over this mood as the Summer advanced and nothing happened. And Halley's Comet, the one time that I saw it, was somewhat of a disappointment. It didn't look a bit as it did in the Sunday papers. It was just a nebulous something away off up there among the unwavering stars and I concluded that Professor Hootentooten was just a damned old fool. It didn't look as if it would hurt a fly. In a few months it passed quietly on its way, out of our corner of the heavens and out of the news. Professor Hootentooten went back into the bottle and I developed an outdrop. It never amounted to much, though.

•A minister was puzzled. He found that several I.O.U.'s were dropped in the offering plate. He thought it was being done by a practical joker, but some weeks later he found in the plate an envelope containing bills equal to the I.O.U.'s. They ranged from $5 to $15 and were apparently based on whatever the donor happened to think the sermon worth.

Then came a Sunday when the sermon was not up to par. After the service, the usual envelope was in one of the plates. But the slip of paper read: "U.O. Me $5."

—Church Management

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The State Department should be overhauled

The Bedeviled Tribes

By Wallace R. Deuel

From his column in the Providence Journal

THERE is no such thing as the State Department," a student of American foreign policy recently remarked. "There is only an alliance of loosely federated tribes.

"The members of these tribes have similar backgrounds and interests, and they all have something to do with foreign policy. But there's no real unity, coherence or central authority among them. The Secretary of State doesn't run these tribes. The real bosses are the tribal chiefs."

The critic was bitter. He exaggerated—some.

But the picture he drew of conditions in the State Department—and the foreign service—was not far wrong in its main outlines.

For a good many years the organization and operating methods of American diplomacy have suffered from—and in—weltering chaos of authority and responsibility that have gravely handicapped the making and carrying out of foreign policy.

There are several causes for this chaos. Here are the most important ones:

Strains caused by the war and now by the reconversion of policy to a peacetime basis.

The legacy of 12 years of highly personal management—or mismanagement—by President Roosevelt.

Frequent changes in the high command of American foreign policy.

Cliquishness within the State Department and the foreign service.

The inefficiencies of most if not all civil service and Government procedures in general.

Lack of adequate funds, resulting in inability to hire enough people and able enough people to do the work.

Lack of management know-how among most diplomats.

The coming of the war multiplied by several times the amount of work the department and the foreign service had to do. The war also gave the department kinds of work it never had done before.

At the same time, the war made it harder for the department to recruit the numbers and kinds of men needed to do its work. Moreover, office space, supplies and equipment of all kinds became harder to get.

Finally, the war made it seem necessary or desirable to give the armed forces great authority in matters of foreign policy. Many of the military had neither the time, the energy, the inclination nor the expert knowledge to use this authority wisely . Much confusion inevitably resulted.

The switch-over from war to peace is piling still further burdens on American foreign policy. Typi-

© 1946, by the Chicago Daily News, Chicago, Illinois

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cal of these burdens is the dumping into the department of parts of five war agencies and the jobs they have been doing: the Office of Strategic Serivces, Office of War Information, Office of the Co-ordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Foreign Ecinomic Administration and Army-Navy Liquidation Commission.

Roosevelt's legacy is another factor. President Roosevelt was an extraordinarily bad administrator. He tried to do too much himself. He seldom either clearly divided or clearly delegated authority or responsibility.

The executive branch of the government had enormous powers during Roosevelt's presidency, and these powers were only loosely defined. As usually happens in such situations, there was a knock-down drag-out battle royal for power in Washington.

Characters who are adept in this kind of a struggle seized, kept and wielded power. The State Department and foreign service do not excel in this sort of contest. More specifically; neither Secretary Hull nor Secretary Stettinius excelled in it. Therefore real power in foreign policy was wielded by other men and ministries altogether—the Treasury, for example.

This caused more confusion in the making and carrying out of foreign policy. The State Department and foreign service suffered accordingly. Frequent changes were another trouble.

Few Secretaries of State, under secretaries or assistant secretaries in recent times have been notably able executives. Also, few of them have had any profound or expert knowledge of foreign affairs when they have assumed affice.

Just about the time these men have gotten well acquainted with their department—and fairly well acquainted with foreign affairs—there has been a presidential election or some other cause for change.

Thereupon the high command of American foreign policy has all been replaced. The new men usually have started from scratch, just as their predecessors had done.

Like the King of England, the Secretary of State may reign under circumstances like these, but he does not rule. There has been no vigorous, expert, continuing leadership in and of the department and the service.

Therefore a "small handful of wilful men"—and women—who are expert in department procedure and in foreign affairs can and sometimes do control American foreign policy.

For another thing, government methods are notoriously clumsy and time-consuming. State Department procedures are no exception. In principle, every penny of the taxpayer's money must be accounted for. It must be proven that every penny is spent by a person duly authorized by law in a manner duly authorized by law for a purpose duly authorized by law.

In practice, this admirable principle is as clumsy as it sounds. The government spends staggering amounts for the book-keepers and office space and supplies needed to keep track of things.

"It would be cheaper to give up all this monkey-business and let people steal a couple of million dollars a year," a student said.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, this is so shocking in principle that there is little likelihood of its being put into practice. Meanwhile the mills of bureaucracy continue to grind exceedingly slow, even if not exceeding fine.

A second main cause of inefficiency in the Government is that it is hard to measure achievement in public service.

You can measure the usefulness of an automobile salesman by the number of cars he sells. You can measure the financial value of a radio commentator by the number of laxative pills his program sells. But you can't measure the value of an ambassador so easily.

This tends to put a premium on observance of the letter of the regulations—which can be measured. And this in turn tends to encourage dull conformity to the letter of the law without enough regard for its meaning and purpose.

At its best a diplomatic career service develops *esprit de corps*. At its worst it breeds cliquishness. The State Department and foreign service have their share of both these qualities—and cliquishness is a blight on good management.

The American people are niggardly with the funds they make available for the formation and execution of their national foreign policy.

One of the chief results of this penny-pinching is that the State Department and the foreign service are woefully understaffed.

They don't have enough people—or able enough people—to do all the work they are called upon to do. Both policy and "housekeeping" in American foreign policy suffer in consequence.

Even if all diplomats were able administrators, there still wouldn't be enough of them to carry the burdens of both policy and management. But in fact, most diplomats are not particularly good administrators, any more than doctors, lawyers and newspapermen are.

They are not picked for this kind of ability in the first place. Their work does not develop this kind of know-how.

• A lady called Jane Louden wrote to the Duke of Wellington for permission to sketch the Waterloo Beeches. She received no answer because the Duke unavoidably misread two words in the letter and directed his reply to the Bishop of London, saying:

"The Bishop of London is quite at liberty to make a sketch of the breeches the Duke wore at Waterloo, if they can be found; but the Duke is not aware that they differed in any way from the breeches which he generally wears."

—Phil Fee in the *Irish Radio News*

• A man and a woman were talking about letter writing.

"Ah," said the man, "you women can never write a letter without a postscript."

"Oh, yes, we can," she replied. "I will write one to you and let you see."

A few days later the man received a letter from her, and at the end was written:

"P. S.—What did I tell you?"

—*Montreal Star*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Every Thing That Is

The snow recedes, the brown
  Earth gazes up at blue
Heaven, and heaven down
  At earth, as lovers do.

So spelled are they, so rare,
  And lost in love, and strange,
They are not now aware
  Of us, or time, or change,

Nor what new shapes of love
  Will issue out of this:
Our fields, the fruits thereof,
  And everything that is
  Is of this gaze, this kiss.

—*David Morton*

The Forced Flower

You speak of forcing the forsythia
As if one forced a flower to flower.

Wiser to call your warmth persuasion,
Though even that were a presumption

Since buds must do their own unbudding,
Blooming without or with our bidding.

Our force is chiefly for destruction
And only thus we force a blossom.

—*Robert Francis*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nobody wants the British loan

Bitter Medicine

By Anne O'Hare McCormick

From her column in The New York Times

WASHINGTON buzzed with speculations regarding the purpose of Mr. Churchill's visit to Mr. Truman. Some guessed that the President was seeking to learn from the former Prime Minister whether any more private understandings were reached at Yalta besides the secret agreement published recently by the British and American governments. Despite the White House statement that the American loan to Britain was not mentioned, others surmised that since Mr. Churchill was likely to make direct or indirect reference to the loan, that subject would certainly come up in any discussion of his Missouri speech.

Behind the latter conjecture is the anxiety felt in government circles in Washington, and presumably in London, at the opposition in Congress to the Anglo-American financial agreements. In London in December this correspondent listened to a debate in Parliament and the press which proved how unpalatable the provisions of the loan are to the British people. Any American who imagines that it is pleasanter to receive than to give aid should see how the ordinary Britisher dislikes the necessity of accepting conditions which seem to him galling and fettering. The galling part of the transaction, of course, is the necessity. It is hard for a once-rich creditor nation to face the fact that it has no alternative to becoming a debtor on the best terms it can get.

In Washington the other side of the argument is being polished up for the Congressional debate.

Opposition is said to be hardening around the objection that the British agreement sets a precedent for loans to other governments. The "anti" argument most frequently heard among the legislators is that requests for vast sums for reconstruction will come from Russia, France, Poland, Yugoslavia and other countries which can give no assurance either of stable government or how and for what purpose the money will be spent. How can they be refused if Britain is favored, ask these practicing debaters, and how can they be granted without causing Americans to unload their bonds and undermining government credit?

To this objection Mr. Brynes made the answer that this credit is not a precedent for anything. "It is unique," he said, "because the position of Britain in world trade, her need for working capital and the effect on world trade of her acquiring that working capital, all are unique."

Mr. Byrnes stated further that the British loan does not establish a precedent because it constitutes an agreement between two of the

© 1946, by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world's largest economic units on a system and policy of world trade. By committing themselves to support the United States trade proposals, he declared, the British become our economic allies and not our economic enemies in a movement away from the war and pre-war commercial nationalism toward "the traditional liberal American dream of a freer world of trade."

The implication is that British acceptance of the conditions of the loan is more valuable to both nations and to the world economy than the money itself. This was the point stressed by Lord Keynes in his spirited defense of these conditions in the House of Lords. The British resent the terms because they limit British freedom and give us the upper hand. Undoubtedly they will resent them more when the time comes to pay the interest on the loan.

The truth is that neither country likes the loan. The average American thinks the United States cannot afford to add nearly four billion dollars to its already astronomical debt and the average Britisher thinks Britain cannot afford to put herself within the "straitjacket" the terms impose. But the real question is whether either country can afford any other course. What will happen to us if Britain is not helped to recovery as a commercial power? Whether we like it or not and Britain likes it or not, the necessities of our common existence force us together in peace as they forced us together in war.

Today the world is incomparably poorer and more unsettled than after the last war, or than anybody conceived it would be when the enemy collapsed in this war. It will be a long time until the great market of Europe reaches its former standard of production or consumption. Nothing in the present political or economic outlook encourages the hope that it will ever again be what it was.

The historic speech of Premier Stalin, certainly the weightiest of all post-war utterances, sounds like a return to the policy of the past, when the Russian people were called to gird themeselves to fight the capitalist world. Actually it is a definition of policy for the future for an empire that covers vastly more ground than it did in the twenties. And because it is an economic as well as a political and military definition, it has a distinct bearing as it will have great influence, if carried out, on world economy. It is a challenge that makes it all the more imperative to work desperately for some approach to unity as the alternative to conflict; but if this tortured world is to be divided into closed zones, obviously it is of the first importance to make the one we live in as large and free as possible.

•At a current events meeting, a clubwoman was asked by a friend what she thought of *Dumbarton Oaks*.

"I haven't had a chance to read it yet," she replied. "But I always admired O'Neill. That's the sequel to *Desire Under the Elms*, isn't it?"

—Counterpoints

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Riots in Bombay point necessary change in our policy

The 'Twain Should Meet

By Royce Brier

From his column in the San Francisco Chronicle

BOMBAY is not normally so explosive a city as Calcutta. The native masses are better off in Bombay (for one thing, the climate is less enervating), and the city has a certain Western feeling of destiny which is lacking in any other Indian city. Calcutta is one of the most depressing communities on earth. Bombay is not depressing, though of course it is hardly exhilarating, either.

Calcutta had trouble last month, and that ended in a typical inertia. The current trouble in Bombay arose from a mutiny in the Indian Navy. The Indian Navy is a gunboat outfit manned by Indians with British officers. The mutiny was due to slow demobilization and such things. Ordinarily it would be strictly a military problem of persuading the mutineers they couldn't get away with it.

But the tension under the surface of these Indian communities, and in fact under the surface of all Asiatic communities, is now giving off a very high hum. Thus any excuse for revolt in the streets is a good enough excuse anywhere on the great half circle from Cairo to Shanghai.

The result in Bombay was that trouble in the harbor merely touched off the fuse ashore, where hundreds of thousands of Hindus were waiting to express again their hatred of British rule. So mobs of unmanageable proportions have roamed through the city for a couple of days, looting, burning and endangering the European colony.

If you had happened to be in Bombay twenty years ago and observed a disturbance there, you might now note that Indian mobs are changing their pattern somewhat. Until recently they have been moved by the non-violence philosophy which is essentially Hindu, and which was used by Gandhi's operators as a political instrument.

Twenty years ago Indian mobs liked to lie down in the streets, boxing up the vehicles of the British constabulary and presenting a baffling problem. This was a terrifying sight when performed by five or ten thousand, and it had a slow motion picture effect which was a little inhuman. Nowadays, however, nonviolence seems outmoded, and Indian mobs appear as active as mobs anywhere else. Perhaps they are more furious than they were, or have decided patience doesn't pay.

Note another circumstance, that things and people British are not the sole target of Indian fury today. Recently an American flag was burned in Calcutta, and American soldiers have been caught with Bri-

© 1946, by the San Francisco Chronicle

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tish as targets for mob action. In Bombay the mobs were even attacking their own countrymen who wear European garb, which is fairly common with clerks in the big commercial houses of India.

Thus Down with Britain has become by extension Down with the West in these Indian disturbances, and this is significant and well worth cogitation by Americans. We have so long held ourselves to be a special product of the Western civilization, largely immune to Eastern prejudice against the West, that it comes as a shock to us to find ourselves in the same boat with the British.

But all this was historically inevitable. The great smoldering mass which is Asia, half of mankind, has a reckoning with the other, and unless the other half changes its viewpoint somewhat, that reckoning is likely to be very unpleasant.

This viewpoint of the West was acquired almost with the birth of the West, when in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, full of beans, we went looking for the rest of the world to exploit and hit the China coast following the Polo saga. England, Spain and Portugal were the spearheads of those buccaneering enterprises, but Spain was decaying and Portugal was small, and in the end England became the chief beneficiary of Asiatic exploitation, with Holland and France trailing far behind.

The viewpoint didn't change greatly over the centuries following. It operated with more and more gentility, because the British are reasonable and essentially humane people, but its main thesis remained: the Asiatics are inferior to Westerners, haven't grown up yet, and for their own good should be controlled—with a fair profit to Westerners.

Now, in history, great ideas like this often keep their material form long after they become illogical. The Holy Roman Empire (as a revival of the old Imperium) is a good example. Further, in history, there are periods when great subterranean forces gather strength, awaiting a historical cycle when they can manifest themselves in a full flow of power.

In this case the forces—the hunger of Asia for freedom from the Western yoke—have been gathering strength for a century. As participants in our time we lack perspective and can't be sure that the cycle is here when the Asiatics will free themselves, but the signs are very persuasive that the day is at hand. Among the most convincing of the signs is that the West isn't such a hot specimen at ordering its own affairs. Do you think the East doesn't perceive that?

Well, should it be true that the cycle is here, we'd better step out of our position, and retreat to a different viewpoint on the relation of the West and the East. If we don't, we are likely to be surprised no end.

●The only kind of letters women love to receive are those which never should have been written.

—Louisville Courier-Journal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM: SHOULD CONGRESS

YES!

By C. L. Thompson

ARMED hostilities between the United States and Italy ceased on September 8, 1943; between the United States and Germany on May 7, 1945; between the United States and Japan on August 14, 1945. No peace treaties have been signed, nor is there any hope of an early formal end to the war, yet the war is over: to evade the issue on a legal technicality (i.e., peace treaties) is unrealistic on the face of it.

Why then have Congress and President Truman made no move to announce that the war is ended?

The answer lies partly in the type of government under which Congress and the President operate. The United States is governed by a representative federal system, under which all powers not specifically granted to the federal government are reserved to the states. In itself, this restriction has always limited severely the power of the federal government to exercise *direct* jurisdiction over the citizens of the United States. In addition, according to the Constitution of the United States, the powers and functions of the executive, the legislature and the judiciary are defined so that each one will check the other two.

How far the limitations on the federal government in general and the president in particular can be waived in case of an emergency has never been clearly defined. Nowhere in the Constitution is any specific provision made for emergency conditions or emergency powers.

Many constitutional lawyers agree that some sort of emergency power may be exercised by the federal government; the president and Congress have both exercised some emergency authority. Yet in the economic emergency of 1933 the Supreme Court voided federal emergency legislation; this lesson has not been forgotten by the present administration.

The National Industrial Recovery Act, in its preface, has stated that:

> "A national emergency productive of widespread unemployment and disorganization of industry which burdens commerce, effects the public welfare and undermines the standard of living of the American people is hereby declared to exist."

Because of this emergency the statute authorized control over intrastate as well as interstate commerce and delegated very great policy determining power to the President. Although the government contended that the legislation "must be viewed in the light of the grave national crisis" the Supreme Court asserted that the plea of emergency "necessarily stops short of an attempt to justify action which lies outside the sphere of constitutional authority. Extraordinary conditions do not create or enlarge constitutional power."

(Continued on page 722)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ECLARE THE WAR ENDED?

NO!

By Arnaud Bruce Leavelle

Professor of Political Science, Swarthmore College

THE argument against an immediate termination of the war powers was effectively summed up by the late Justice Brandeis, speaking in a case arising out of Word War I, and quoting the prevailing doctrine of our Supreme Court: "It (the war power) is not limited to victories in the field and the dispersion of the insurgent forces. It carries with it inherently the power to guard against the immediate renewal of the conflict, and to remedy the evils which have arisen from its rise and progress."

No one can deny that our government is today deeply involved in efforts to prevent the revival of war. Our activities for this purpose, both within the countries of our defeated enemies, and in cooperation with our Allies, are at least in part based upon the war powers. On the domestic front it would be even more quixotic to argue that we have yet succeeded in remedying the evils arising from the desperate and massive conflict just concluded. The ramifications of war, like history, form a seamless web. The laying down of arms marks only the beginning of the difficult task of unravelling the military, economic and social consequences that war produces.

By the canons of international and municipal law, the final ratification of a treaty of peace, signed by the victorious and the defeated nations, is accepted as the best evidence of the termination of a state of war. However, the United States and Allied governments are now committed to carrying out an occupation program in the Axis countries, which may last five, ten, or even twenty years, before the terms of formal treaties of peace are even considered. Naturally, the question is raised as to whether, and under what circumstances, hostilities should be declared at an end for purposes of domestic legislation and law. The position here taken is not that the war powers should be kept in force until treaties of peace are signed, but rather that each power should be examined on its merits, and repealed only when problems it relates to have been brought under control.

A formal declaration that the war emergency is ended, either by the President and Congress, or by the President alone, would undoubtedly be accepted and enforced by the courts, according to well-established precedent. But such a declaration would automatically wipe out a substantial number of emergency powers granted by Congress to the administration, and would have a disastrous effect upon the orderly re-establishment of the conditions of peace. Such a course is not only undesirable, it is unnecessary under the forms of existing legislation.

A comparison of our position at the end of World War I with our present situation is instructive as to what moves can and should be taken

(Continued on page 727)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page 720)

The war powers of the president and of the Congress, on the other hand, are specifically recognized in the American Constitution. A degree of "war power" is generally recognized as an inherent right of self-defense belonging to every sovereign state. The Supreme Court has consistently held that in the exercise of its war power the United States is not restricted by sections of the Constitution that reserve power to the states and rights to the individual. [Steward V. Kahn, 11 Wall., 493 (1879)]. Thus although the federal government may be able to exercise control over American economy under emergency declarations, as long as a war is on, the war powers are surer and more extensive.

There are specific controls now being exercised by the federal government whose constitutionality might be questioned if the war were "over". The Selective Service Act, in particular, provides that men drafted into the Army and Navy are to serve for the duration of the war plus six months, Congress or the president to make a declaration if the war ended before the termination of the act on May 15, 1945. The men drafted under this act could not legally have been held in the armed forces for more than six months after hostilities ceased if Congress or President Truman had recognized the obvious. Controls on labor, on industry and price and rent controls would all be jeopardized by a frank recognition that the war has ended.

This is not to say that such controls could not be exercised under the emergency powers of the federal government.

EARLY EMERGENCY ACTION

In June, 1941, President Roosevelt ordered the seizure of the North American Aviation Company plant, where striking workers had refused to recognize the ruling of the National Defense Mediation Board. In August of the same year *before* the United States was at war, President Roosevelt also ordered the seizure of the shipyard of the Federal Shipbuilding and Drydock Company, again pointing out that there was a national emergency and that the strikes intefered with vital defense production.

Between 1939 and 1941 President Roosevelt also exercised some control over prices, through his creation of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply. In a memorandum from O.P.A.C.S. a "Summary of Underlying Authority," the O.P.A.C.S. General Counsel points to the President's "implied constitutional powers . . . during a period of emergency," but also to the fact that the emergency *was* a war emergency. There is little doubt that the war and international nature of the emergency of 1930-1941 made it possible for the federal government to assume more power than it had assumed during an economic emergency.

Those who believe that, constitutional or unconstitutional, the New Deal legislation of the 1930's was wise, necessary and practical welcome the opportunity to get similar legislation through under guise of "war". Whether or not any sort of "planned economy" is desirable, the question of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this debate automatically becomes: "Is it legitimate or constitutional to refuse to recognize the end of the war in order to plan American economy?" That federal control over rents, housing, prices, labor and industry represents a radical departure from the federal system of delegated powers cannot be denied. Should such a radical change in our form of government be accomplished by subterfuge?

The question on moral grounds becomes an evaluation of ends and means: those who believe that the end is good *and* that the ends justify the means will answer in the affirmative. To give a strong central government broad powers to accomplish a *good* end, presupposes there is a check on that government: who is to decide on the end? Nazi Germany, fascist Italy and bolshevist Russia all worked toward the economic betterment of their peoples, regardless of the means they employed. In the United States, the people theoretically provide the final check on their government. According to the Constitution, in between elections, when the people's check is dormant, it is the duty of the Supreme Court to protect the reserved rights of the states and the individual. It is perhaps pertinent to point out in passing that the over-ruling of the tradition of two terms for the presidency has drastically reduced the Supreme Court's check, since, as we have seen, in a 16-year term a president can appoint a preponderant majority of the Supreme Court justices. Seven out of nine, in fact.

STRONG GOVERNMENT IS DANGEROUS

Whether or not strong central government is necessary, whether or not planned economy is desirable, it is the author's contention that a strong central government with sweeping powers over the nation's economy is dangerous. Like war crises, economic crises are strains on democratic government. If it is necessary in time of emergency, as in time of war, to increase the power of the president and of Congress, it is vital to set up adequate safeguards, to provide for the return of normal government and to ensure that final control does not pass from the individual.

According to Professor Carl Friedrick, writing of the danger of emergency government, one of the necessary concomittants of emergency power is provision for its ending. Much of the war and emergency legislation put on the statute books during the first World War still stands and was used by President Roosevelt from 1939 to 1941. The Selective Service Act was designed purposely to provide for its own termination if the war ended before May 15, 1946, although this was circumvented by the refusal to recognize the war's end. This refusal deliberately extends the war power of the federal government to uses for which war power was never intended. Although those who uphold the extension of the "war" emergency are thinking of prices, rents, labor legislation and so forth, they overlook the fact that many other war powers of the federal government may still be operative. The war power of the president of the United States includes the control of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such everyday activities of the civilian population as communication by radio, telephone and telegraph, transportation, manufacturing and the supply of important commodities.

After the first World War the United States went for more than two years before any declaration was made that the war was over. A joint resolution passed by Congress on May 15, 1920, was vetoed by President Wilson. Meanwhile many of the war powers of the federal government remained effective.

WORLD WAR I POWERS

Other war powers remained in use. During the steel strikes of 1919, the federal government intervened to put down the strikes and to ferret out "Reds".

On October 6, 1919, according to a description in *Current History,* "General Leonard Wood, commander of the Central Department of the U. S. Army, . . . took charge of the Indiana steel cities of Gary, Indiana Harbor and East Chicago, with 1,000 overseas veterans of the 4th Division armed with cannon, machine guns and rifles. He declared martial law in Gary.

"Troops paraded in steel hats, armed with rifle and bayonet, machine guns and hand grenades, and cannon were mounted in the streets and parks and pointing down the principal thoroughfares. The mills were opened and thousands of workers entered and left the gates without fear. Crowds were kept moving, but picketing was not prevented.

"General Wood declared that the worst influence among the strikers came from certain 'Red' agitators. . . .

"With the discovery in Gary on October 14, 1919, of a plot to destroy government property and to inaugurate a general uprising of 'Reds' from West Virginia to Colorado, a drive on radicals in the United States was started by agents of the Department of Justice and by the military under General Wood." (*Current History,* Vol. XI, Pages 201-202.)

A "Red" scare swept the country and a special division to investigate radical activities was created in the Department of Justice. In short order the Department gathered and indexed the history of about 60,000 radicals. Sweeping raids were organized to collect radical aliens for deportation.

The coal strikers also fared badly when they struck in November, 1919, for a 6-hour day, a 5-day week and a 60 per cent increase in wages. After President Wilson's request that the strike be called off during arbitration had been refused, the President condemned the strike as an attack upon the rights of society and the welfare of the country. He charged the strikers with proposing to abrogate "an agreement as to wages which was made with the sanction of the United States Fuel Administration and which was to run *during the continuance of the war,* but not beyond April 1, 1920." . . . Wilson declared flatly that "the war itself was still a fact."

Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer secured in a federal district court an injunction against union leaders to stop the strike, the court acting on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

basis of the Lever Food Control Act which President Wilson had continued. All the war-time powers of the Fuel Administration were invoked when Fuel Administrator Garfield, acting by direct authority from the President's Cabinet, served formal notice on the conflicting parties that mining operations must be resumed and that coal must be produced "at a reasonable price". As a result of the tremendous government pressure against the strikers, the W.M.W. officials gave in on December 10, 1919. Attorney General Palmer's statement is interesting in this respect, showing how the government policy was enforced on labor leaders.

"The coal strike is settled as the Government wanted it settled. When Messrs. Lewis and Green came to see me Saturday I restated what the Government's position had been from the beginning and insisted on their acquiescence. They finally agreed to it. They have now persuaded the officers of their organization that the situation calls for compliance with the court's order and the Government's wishes, and I am certain that all the miners in the country will cheerfully acquiesce in the decision of their leaders."

Nonetheless, the strikers and their leaders had not accepted unquestioned the federal government's use of war powers. In a joint statement of October 31 (the day they were enjoined) the labor leaders had protested:

"Throughout the period of the war and during the nation's time of stress the miners of America labored patiently, patriotically, and arduously in order that the principles of freedom and democracy might triumph over the forces of arbitrary authority, dictatorship, and despotism.

"When armed hostilities ceased last November the miners found themselves in the paradoxical position where their intensive labors were being used to further enrich the owners of coal mines and merchants dealing in coal by the immediate reduction of the mining of the coal. . . .

"The miners are now told the war is not over and that all war legislation is still in force, and if reports received here are correct the Government intends to apply existing war measures, not against the owners of the coal mines, but against the coal miners. The Government has taken steps to enforce war measures by an injunction and it has restrained the officials of the United Mine Workers from counseling, aiding, or in any way assisting the members of this organization for relief against grievous conditions of life and employment."

The abuse of war power began to disturb other private individuals and Congress. After President Wilson vetoed the joint resolution declaring hostilities at an end, criticism grew. Wilson himself was severely attacked. Senator France summed up the charges, declaring that the war powers were building up autocratic government in the United States, that:

"American citizens have, in violation of the law protecting inherent natural rights, been hurled into dungeons for disagreeing with the views of the majority, while the Postmaster General, renegade from the principles of Jeffersonian democracy, seized and censored the mails and wires in his autocratic clutch, while spies and secret service agents from a department which disgraces the very name of justice have prowled about as they did in the old

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

days in Russia seeking whom they might destroy. Intimidation, search, and seizure without warrant, brutality, torture, perjury, provocation of crime, the holding of prisoners without sentence and the sentencing of prisoners without sense or the sanctions of justice, bloodshed, and, if we can credit rumors current in New York, which I cannot verify, even murder, these have been their methods."

An extension of the war powers of the federal government for two years after the close of the first World War resulted in many violations of individual rights, strike-breaking with federal troops, the imposition of many anti-labor policies by the federal government. Retention of sweeping war powers may have delayed—but it did not prevent at all—the inflation of the 1920's and the violent depression that followed.

As a matter of fact, President Wilson's refusal to declare the war at an end was based not on economic policy, but on his whole-hearted desire to get the United States to sign the Versailles Treaty and become a member of the League of Nations. It is interesting that, whatever effect this had, it did not accomplish its principal purpose. Then, as now, the federal government hoped, through the war powers, to hold down the cost of living. This also failed. There is little reason to suppose that the federal government will be any more successful now.

At the present time, the United States has an overpowering debt which, presumably, can be serviced only if some degree of controlled inflation is permitted. The war inflation to date has resulted in bettering the relative economic position of both the large corporations and organized labor. Unquestionably the Roosevelt administration was more favorable to organized labor than to large corporations. Unquestionably the Roosevelt administration planned to better the position of organized labor, believing that this was in the interest of the country as a whole. Apparently, at the war's end, if all restrictions had been removed, the corporations would have profited more than any other group, due to planning which had really gone astray. That General Motors could withstand a strike for a full year and, in fact, be recompensed by the federal treasury, was never contemplated by the administration.

On at least one other occasion the United States tried to work out an economic plan outside the Constitution. President Jefferson expected by the embargo on all shipping to gain everything that could have been gained by a successful war against France and England. He planned in the process to strengthen the American economic structure. As a matter of fact, the economic system was almost ruined and the country fought a disastrous war with England in 1812. Fortunately constitutional government survived both the embargo and the expanded war powers of 1919-1920. In both cases departure from constitutional procedure worked more harm than good, in spite of the intents of the planners. There is little basis for believing that plans of the present administration will be more successful.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page 721)

today. After the first World War the problem of terminating war powers was complicated by two factors. In the first place, the war legislation had been so phrased that in many cases it appeared that only a blanket declaration of the end of hostilities would suffice to terminate. In the second place, President Wilson was involved in a bitter political controversy with the Senate over the ratification of the Versailles Treaty, which would, of course, have established peace, but which would also have taken us into the League of Nations. Wilson declined to proclaim the end of hostilities, with the obvious intent of using this refusal as a club to force Senate acceptance of the League. An attempt by Congress through legislative act to declare the end of the war was vetoed. Finally, however, with the defeat of the Versailles Treaty, and pending the Treaty of Berlin, which formally ended our war with Germany, Wilson succumbed to the inevitable and signed termination legislation. The upshot was that World War I was concluded for different purposes on three separate dates: for trading with the enemy in 1919 through State Department order; for purposes of most war-time legislation on March 3, 1921; and for municipal law governing private suits on July 2, 1921.

TWO CATEGORIES OF WAR POWERS

The situation today is substantially different. Congressional suspicion of the executive's war-time power expressed itself in legislation in much more specific and more easily worked termination provisions. Our war powers today, aside from the exclusively military power flowing directly from the Constitution to the president, break down into two broad categories. The first group includes special powers, or programs, which automatically end on a specific date, and the second, those which terminate on the proclamation of the "end of hostilities," the "emergency," or the "conclusion of the state of war."

It is significant that most of the war-time projects which involved large grants of power or large amounts of money, or which interested the great pressure groups, were placed in the first category and given life only by two-year installments. Included were the First and Second War Powers Act, Selective Service, Price Control, the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, Lend Lease, U.N.N.R.A. and others. Some of these acts, or parts of them, have already expired, as with the War Powers Acts; some have been liquidated through executive action before the date of expiration, as with Lend Lease; and it may be assumed that the most careful congressional scrutiny will accompany any renewal of authority beyond the periods set. It is to be hoped, incidentally, that politics will not corrupt the conscience of Congress in extending these powers where the national interest clearly demands them.

The second category of war powers is presumably the one which agitates those who fear the misuse of governmental authority during the reconversion

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

period. But just what do these powers consist of? The Attorney-General in a recent report to the President lists over 250 acts which terminate on a declaration of the end of the war, or within a few months thereafter. A breakdown shows the following rough classification.

There is a large group of acts permitting special powers or arrangements in the armed forces: temporary appointments for particular jobs in the Army, Navy and Veterans' Adiministration; military exemption of $1500 from income taxes; allotments to service men's families; extra pay for service abroad; use of educational institutions for special military training programs; tax free shipments of tobacco to our forces.

There is an equally large collection of enactments designed to protect our national security; the prevention of the publication of inventions or the granting of patents when the national interest requires; increasing the severity of penalties for espionage, and the inspection of the plants and books of contractors working on defense orders.

A much smaller group of statutes projects government control or assistance into areas of the economy which have been intimately associated with or much deranged by the war effort. Examples are the Lanham Act, providing for emergency housing, the provision for the requisitioning of shipping where essential to national security, the suspension under certain conditions of prosecutions of business combinations under anti-trust laws, and the War Labor Disputes Act.

The above list is not exhaustive, but it is typical and illustrative. The War Labor Board, which operated under the War Labor Disputes Act, has already been scrapped by presidential order, although it could have been continued, like the other agencies and powers, until a declaration of the end of hostilities. All of the powers listed in the second category, of course, can be so nullified by the President. Further, while Congress alone apparently cannot declare the end of the war, it may, according to the provisions of most of the acts, legislate a death sentence for particular powers through concurrent resolution. In a few cases, presidential proclamation alone is mentioned. Even here, Congress could repeal its own law, provided the President agreed, or if he did not, provided a two-thirds majority were available, to over-ride his veto. However, the results of dropping the War Labor Board form at least one example of the dubious wisdom of an immediate dissolution of war agencies. It is not unfair to point out that the special powers and techniques of this Board might have been of great value in present labor-management conflicts. These conflicts are the natural offspring of the war period. The hypothetical dangers and theoretical objections to the continuance of these powers through the period of adjustment needs to be balanced against the actual social cost and individual suffering resulting from strikes and delayed production.

For the rest of the powers listed, what candid mind would deny that all are desirable and some absolutely essential? Would it be wise to sabotage our program of occupation abroad and compound the present difficulties of the armed forces by eliminating with one stroke the many special arrange-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments in military government and administration which that program requires? Would it be fair to our servicemen to destroy suddenly the existing benefits to them and their families? Would it not be highly dangerous to relax security regulations on scientific and industrial processes essential to defense, in view of the somewhat delicate nature of the atomic bomb problem, and the evidences of espionage already revealed? Would it be sound public policy for government to abandon at this time its special controls over such crucial fields as housing and the merchant marine?

In answer to these questions, the opponents of continuing what war powers remain through the period of adjustment to peace would no doubt contend that if these powers were cut off the Congress would be capable of handling existing problems on a peace-time basis and through normal procedures. The fallacies in this position are not difficult to find. It assumes that our present problems are ordinary ones subject to the usual methods of treatment, and further, that Congress is equipped and is motivated politically to tackle them vigorously and with dispatch. Neither assumption is altogether true. With Congress overburdened by present legislative proposals and numerous investigations, to say nothing of filibusters and archaic procedures, it would not appear to be good sense to subject it to a new avalanche of issues.

Those who oppose governmental action in principle, and those who still cling to that most ancient of American political phobias, fear of the executive, invariably seek refuge in Congress. The truth is that the working efficiency and future success of our governmental institutions is dependent not only upon the preservation of ultimate legislative responsibility, but also upon the development of creative and powerful executive action backed by legislative authority. But whatever one's view of the long range problem of the executive-legislative relation, there can be no sound objection to the device of extending the war powers until the war problems are solved. It remains delegation of authority by the legislature, controlled by a majority vote in most cases, and in a very few, by the possible necessity of a two-thirds majority. Hence, those who raise cries of danger at this use of the war power are either dragging red herrings across the rocky road of reconversion, or are arguing from some other theory of government than our constitutional democracy or from some other conception of the location of the public interest than is embodied in our tradition of majority rule.

There is no issue of constitutional morality here. It is not even necessary to adopt the subtle supporting argument of the Supreme Court that emergencies do not create new powers, but rather bring into effect powers already implicit in the Constitution. It is enough to point out that these powers were granted by Congress and can be removed by Congress, that they are exercised by a president who is constitutionally and politically responsible for his actions, and that they represent the most effective present means for dealing with problems of extraordinary magnitude and complexity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Liberal" and "reactionary" call up past horrors

Picture Them!

By Charles Fisher

From his column in the Philadelphia Record

CONFIRMED readers of these items may have noted the recurrence lately of old-fashioned words like liberal and reactionary, and a certain amount of forthright reference to the New Deal.

That is because we are an old-fashioned guy and because we have suddenly remembered that the words, shabby and uninteresting as they are now after years of usage, still have immensely important meanings.

We couldn't define either of them in detail, but we know what we mean by liberal and by reactionary and so, we believe, do most people. The terms are pretty nearly indispensable. They describe political and social attitudes a great deal better than party labels. What point is there, for example, in saying some lawgiver in Washington is a Democrat when you don't explain his geographical origin?

Moreover, it seems to us that the present great dispute between liberal and reactionary principles (see how handy they are, those words?) might best be fought out for a while as a simple problem in black and white. This is no time for subtleties.

We'd like to see artists go back to drawing industry—maybe we'd better make that the more obdurate sections of large industry—as a pompous fellow in top hat and cutaway, trying to impose shackles on an overalled figure labeled "Labor". We'd like the G.O.P. depicted as a corpulent figure in much the same mode, except that his pockets would be bulging with currency.

He'd be sitting in a swivel chair and from beneath him would protrude the scrawny neck of The Common People. Except that it wouldn't be as scrawny as it used to be, and there would be an oddly alert look in the eye, and one fist would be clutching a short, useful section of lead pipe.

And Congress . . . . Well, we'd return to the classic mode and have a dull-eyed ancient in a frayed frock coat, mounted on a good, old-fashioned soap box and trying to hold shut a bulging door. Through a crack in the door you would see documents with arms and legs drawn on them, and they would be labelled "Issues."

As for U.S. Steel—we'd make it a conventional octopus, crushing hordes of small figures in its tentacles; and it would be assailed by a brave and gallant lad, in overalls of course, bearing the "Labor" tag. General Motors would be a great stamping press coming down on a tiny but tough-looking nut called "Unions."

Do we believe in all those images?

© 1946, by the Philadelphia Record, Philadelphia, Pa.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Maybe not exactly. For a while we didn't quite believe in them at all, but that was before certain forces returned to ancient methods of attack and gave us an odd feeling that the past decade or so had been erased.

If those are the methods of reaction—what would you do without the word? It would take a paragraph to make the idea clear without it—it seems to us that the resistance should be reshaped accordingly. When management cries of labor "Those guys want everything," what is there for labor to do but cry back "Those guys want to *keep* everything."

After all, the liberals didn't start it. Labor has compromised heavily in all the strikes. Proof of the reasonableness of the compromises is that they have been accepted in so many major cases. The holdouts are the fellows who decline to look at the calendar. And one extreme is soon opposed by another, and if it doesn't make for good sense, it does make for a certain amount of fun.

Speculation and red tape keep wheat from Europe

The Wheat Bottleneck

By Marquis Childs

From his column in The Washington Post

A thousand wheat elevators in the Dakotas, Minnesota, Nebraska and Montana are plugged, which means that they are so full of wheat they cannot take anymore. The number of carloads of grain moved in January was close to the record all-time high set for the same month in 1944.

Yet Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson announces that commitments of wheat for Europe will be short 150,000 tons in February and even more in March.

With the need in the rest of the world so desperate, Secretary Anderson's announcement has a kind of calm, casual sound as though this deficit were no great concern of his. Unfortunately, it is typical of the attitude in the Department of Agriculture.

Last summer policy makers in the department were busy saying that the food shortage in Europe surely would not be as serious as some alarmists said; and that, since the estimates were certainly exaggerated, there was no need to be too worried over preparations to meet such a shortage. There were others who foresaw the present crisis, but they were overruled. Certain conscientious public servants resigned because they could not endure the Pollyanna approach in the Department of Agriculture.

We are now witnessing the buck-

© 1946, by the United Features Syndicate, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passing stage, with agriculture anxious to unload the blame for current failures. It has several times been intimated that lack of transportation is the reason why shipments abroad have fallen below the promise made.

But the Association of American Railroads points to carloadings of grain of near-record volume. For January of this year, the figure was 207,158 cars, which compares with 226,825 in January of '44, the record year, and 117,396 in 1940, a year of high prosperity.

Furthermore, this is being done with 5000 fewer boxcars than were available before the war. In the Pacific Northwest recently, 4000 cars of wheat were moved in 20 days. The Railroad Association insists that, when government grain is made available for shipment abroad, it is hauled.

What is happening then to this priceless stuff so badly needed to combat the world's hunger? There are two fairly good answers.

One, of course, is our own high rate of consumption and waste in our present boom psychology. Putting the nation on brown bread will cut this down somewhat, but not substantially.

Although it is hard to estimate its effect with any exactness, a far more serious reason would seem to be the beginning of a tendency to hold back grain in the hope of a speculative price rise. This reflects the restiveness permeating the whole economy since the bulge in the price line under the new wage-price formula.

Powerful lobbies are working intensely to break price control as it applies to farm products. Among them are lobbyists for grain elevator men and grain speculators.

Their reasoning is fairly obvious. They say that everybody else in the economy—labor and industry—is getting theirs, and so why shouldn't they? But what they are doing, really, is gambling with world security.

Make no mistake, either, they are a powerful group—the farmers and, with them, the handlers and processors of grain. During the war, when acute shortage of corn to make alcohol actually threatened the war production program, it was possible to take only the most timid and tentative steps to end hoarding on the farms.

One target of the lobbyists is the system of government subsidies which during the war, were used to stimulate farm production and yet make it possible to keep farm prices within bounds. Chester Bowles, who now has wartime powers as the new director of the revived Office of Economic Stabilization, says that continuation of these subsidies is absolutely essential to price control.

He said, too, in his statement before the House Banking and Currency Committee, that the prices the farmer receives went up 113 per cent during the war, which is exactly the amount they went up in World War I. But the prices he pays, including interest and taxes, have risen only 40 per cent, as compared to 94 per cent in the previous war.

It is up to Congress to serve notice on the speculators that there will be no price rise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The moral implications of our economic crisis

Vulture's Paradise

By Howard Vincent O'Brien

From his column "All Things Considered" in the Chicago Daily News

WHEN we talk of "the labor problem," we tend to think of it as a struggle between vast agglomerations of power, such as the C.I.O. and the United States Steel Corporation. The fact is, however, that this problem gnaws at the vitals of small business even more than it does of big.

Traveling around the country, I am shocked to find how nearly universal is this conflict between employer and employed. It is just as bitter in the small shop, employing a half-dozen workers, as it is in General Motors, with its millions.

Between government regulation and the insatiable demands of his help, the small businessman is between the devil and the deep sea.

Typical is the case of a small newspaper publisher with whom I talked. "When I started my paper," he said, "I kept the books myself. Now, with all the government paper work to be done, I have to have a full-time bookkeeper. In those days I was boss; and deadlines were what I made them. Today, the printers set the deadlines. Hell or high water, they quit at 5 o'clock.

"Mind you," he went on, "I'm not complaining. I'm for social security and tax-withholding and all that; and I'm for high wages and short hours, too. All I ask is that things get organized so I can tell from one day to another what I have to do."

My impression is that the average employee simply doesn't grasp the elementary principles of capitalism. He hasn't yet learned the real meaning of "money." He has somehow acquired the idea that it is now possible to eat cake and have it, too.

He is spellbound in the belief that he can work less and gain more. Despite all the exhortation of economists—both labor and managerial—he cannot seem to understand that you can't have wealth without production: and that you can't have production without producing.

So the silly argument goes on, with strikes being "settled" by the simple expedient of raising wages—and prices to match. Obviously, this is no settlement. But its childishness seems apparent to nobody but children—who know they can't have sand-castles without building them.

One major by-product of this zanie thinking is the debasement of character suffered by those who think they gain from it. With every unearned dollar goes a corresponding loss of self-respect.

Inflation has proceeded far enough, now, to show what it does to morals. Bribery is growing like a prairie fire. The black market is no longer a furtive illegality, pa-

© 1946, by The Chicago Daily News, Chicago, Illinois

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tronized only by the depraved. It is becoming the *only* market.

Want a railroad ticket? Slip the conductor something. Need a hotel room? A fin to the clerk will do the trick. Crave butter? The boy at the grocery will take care of you if you make it worth his while. Like pork chops? The long green will melt the heart of any butcher.

This is exaggeration, of course. The vast majority of conductors and hotel clerks and butchers and bakers and candlestickmakers are honest folk, with no taste for accepting bribes. But the refusal of the nation to face the facts of economics is making life steadily more difficult for honest folk. As prices rise, the necessity for economic cannibalism increases. It is dog eat dog—and to hell with morals. Unless we can wake up, we're headed for a vulture's paradise.

The pattern of the senatorial attack of labor

"Smash Their Ends"!

By Victor Riesel

From his column "Labor News and Comment" in the New York Post

BACK in high school, when getting the varsity letter was more important even than borrowing a tuxedo for the senior prom, our scrawny football squad would listen grimly before each weekend game to Pop, the coach, tell us to go out and "smash their ends for the first half, then run like hell around them during the second."

Now, years later, after watching the big strikes wind up I get the feeling that this same strategy is being used on the big unions by the nation's toughest and most conservative industrialists. These business men are carrying their anti-labor fight from the picket lines right into the Senate.

There, heavy industry's conservative senatorial friends are hammering away at the ends of the labor movement in the hope that the powerful unions, which tied up the giants of American industry this winter, will be permanently softened up without a costly drive through the center of the line.

Here is the conservative Senators' strategy: Understand it and you know the background of much of the industrial civil war in years to come. And you'll also understand what "Little Business" has been trying to do with those big anti-union ads it has placed in recent days.

Some Senators have introduced bills which would outlaw the closed shop, maintenance of membership and the dues checkoff. Before you bypass those technical words—stop. Without them labor would collapse. And before the union chiefs give them up there will be one bitter knockdown fight.

© 1946, by The New York Post Syndicate, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The closed shop is vital to unions because it means that all hands hired by a plant must be union members. No one else can be taken on.

Maintenance of membership is equally important. It guarantees that all men who join a union when the contract is first signed must stay in that union or be fired.

The checkoff clause—under which the company takes union dues out of the pay check each week—gives labor financial stability. Imagine what would happen if Philip Murray's steel union had to go after 750,000 men each week to collect dues—it just could not be done.

While the public has had its eyes on the wage fight, the companies and the unions have been battling on these equally basic issues. The General Motors Corporation, for example, was ready to grant the union 19½ cents wage increase if G.M. could knock the maintenance of membership clause out of the new contract, I learned from those who have been in the G.M. wage conference. That's what really delayed a settlement.

This attitude is nationwide. Just a few days ago the American Management Association which represents some 10,000 of the country's top executives, was handed a private survey that showed "the majority attitude" of management everywhere was that "maintenance of membership clauses should be removed . . . checkoff provisions should be refused . . ."

If successful, this would mean that the mammoth C.I.O. and A.F.L. unions would lose most of their members and eventually face bankruptcy. So watch for the Senate's conservatives to rally behind Republican Senator Moore, who quietly has introduced eight bills to eliminate these union privileges.

If Moore wins, he will really knock the ends off labor—and permit the opposition to fence it in with ease.

• A young lawyer attended the funeral of a millionaire. A friend arrived at the service and took a seat beside him. He whispered, "How far has the service gone?"

The lawyer nodded toward the clergyman in the pulpit and whispered back: "Just opened the defense."

—Volta Review

• And our divorce rate keeps going up. The newer twists came from a man in Salem, Massachusetts, who is seeking a divorce on grounds of cruelty because his wife refused to kiss him in Grand Central Station in New York when he returned home after two years in the Navy, and from Los Angeles, where a man decided he could support either his wife or his horse, but not both, so he has chosen the horse.

• "And now, children," inquired the Sunday School teacher, in a review of the day's lesson, "who can tell me what we must do before we can expect forgiveness of sin?"

There was a moment's pause, and then little Wilbur made his logical contribution: "Well," he said, "first we have got to sin."

—Farm Journal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITOR

Should Congress Extend the O.P.A. Beyond June 30?

The battle against inflation rages around continued price control.

PLANNED CONFUSION

Chester Bowles is guilty of a reckless use of the English language when he charges that the National Association of Manufacturers has threatened a sit-down strike against the American people unless price ceilings are removed.

The N. A. M. advocates full production as the best way to overcome scarcities and reverse the trend toward inflation. It contends that price controls discourage full production, either by compelling manufacturers to produce at a loss or limiting production to a day-to-day basis in view of the possibility of arbitrary government action making costs and selling prices subject to change at a moment's notice.

The one factor which Bowles and other believers in a government-planned economy have overlooked is the profit motive, without which the free enterprise system cannot function. It is because of profits, or the hope of profits, that business engages in productive enterprises, thereby creating jobs and producing goods.

Some evidence supporting the position of the N. A. M. and refuting Bowles' arguments came to light yesterday in a statement by Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Company.

Ford said that his company's most popular model, which had cost $512 to make in 1941, was actually costing $963 last November. The O. P. A. price ceiling to dealers on this model is now $728.

Thus the company was losing $235 on each car of this model it produced three months ago.

"Since then," Ford said, "we have cut that cost somewhat by increased production efficiency, but in the meantime we have added $41,000,000 to our annual bill for wages, and still have to absorb increased costs to us and our suppliers due to the new price of steel."

Faced by a similar squeeze between costs and price ceilings, many small companies without the resources of Ford are likely to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be forced out of business, which would bring about an unhealthy condition in our national economy, disrupting production still more and limiting job opportunities.

Under the new government policy, the situation may work itself out provided government controls are relinquished at the earliest possible moment and provided there are no further labor disturbances to retard production and upset the existing cost structure.

—*The Cleveland Plain Dealer*

PRICE CONTROL VS. THE INFLATIONARY ROAD

It would be a sweet thing for the automotive industry, temporarily, if the government should follow the advice of Henry Ford II and cancel price ceilings for that industry and its suppliers. This is the easy way out of all our reconversion problems—just abolish economic controls and watch the factory wheels go round. Yet no one who makes such a suggestion bothers to discuss what happened after World War I, when we had no price controls.

Mr. Ford is asking that a single segment of our economy be given a special license to raise prices without restriction. Does anyone imagine we could stop there? Lifting the lid for automobiles would mean, lifting the lid on steel, aluminum, electric motors and rubber. And no government official could hold back the rest.

The record of 1919-20 shows what would happen if general economic controls were lifted. More than 43 per cent of the first World War's inflation came *after* the 1918 armistice. This inflation did not strike food and rents alone—items which Mr. Ford admits might now be left under ceilings—but spread through industry.

The wholesale prices of raw materials climbed an additional 28 per cent; prices of finished manufactured products went up 30 per cent. There was a wonderful boom, and then a wonderful collapse. Corporations, after their huge profits of 1919, suffered a net loss in 1921, and more than 5,600,000 workers were added to the unemployment rolls.

There is only one way to get the country safely through the reconversion period, and that is to avoid hogwild price rises.

The first essential is to settle labor disputes through the tested process of collective bargaining.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The second best thing is for Congress to declare itself clearly on continued price controls—to protect the public, workers, farmers and industry itself. Civilian distribution of goods was delayed when the excess profits tax repeal made distribution this year more profitable; it will be delayed again if producers are allowed to hope that, in the near future, price controls will disappear.

—*Chicago Sun*

AN ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

The basic cause of inflation is the increase in the money supply. In this country money has nearly tripled since the outbreak of the war in Europe. When the supply of money that people have to offer for goods is three times as great as it was, and the supply of goods is the same, prices are bound to go up. When more money is being offered against the same amount of goods, the value of money falls.

The main cause of the increase in the country's money and credit supply has been the continued budget deficit. The government spends more than it receives in taxes; it borrows the difference; and, to the extent that its bonds are bought by the commercial banks, they are paid for by creating new deposits—in other words, new money.

The most important step to be taken to stop inflation is to balance the budget as soon as possible—certainly in the next fiscal year.

Higher prices of goods are the consequence of inflation; they are not the inflation itself. Halting the increase in the supply of money and increasing the supply of goods by greater production are the two main measures we must take, therefore, to combat inflation and high prices.

Price ceilings, however, do not in themselves do either of these things. They do not halt the increase in the money supply; they do not cure the shortage of goods.

Price control has now only a transitional and secondary role to play in combating inflation.

If the ground has been prepared for it immediately after the Japanese surrender, the best course would probably have been to let the federal price control expire at the end of June and to put the states and localities on notice that it would be their duty from then on to take over rent control But previous failure to move in this direction now seems likely to force an extension.

If the stabilization acts are to be extended, however, it is clear that there would be written into them explicit provisions to limit their application and insure their termination.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> The best methods of limiting or terminating price controls are matters of detail to be decided after careful study. But one thing is clear. Congress cannot safely continue to give the Executive in peacetime the same blanket powers over price and wage control that were embodied in the wartime stabilization acts. Government price and wage control is a dangerous weapon even in the most skillful hands.
>
> —*The New York Times*

PRICE CONTROL

If the federal budget were to be balanced as of today the need for a price control agency would still exist. For the O. P. A. is grappling with the after-effects of an inflationary form of war financing, and this is what constitutes an immediate threat to the price structure. That threat will continue for a long time. According to estimates of the Federal Reserve Board the cash, bank deposits and Government securities held by individuals and corporations are now about three and a half times what they were at the end of 1939, having risen from $65,000,000,000 at that date to $225,000,000,000 by the end of 1945. Approximately $90,000,000,000 of the last-named total consists of government bank holdings; in fact, savings bonds are vitually demand deposits.

This immense volume of actual and potential purchasing power in the hands of the public can be shifted about, but it cannot be reduced except through retiring federal debt. And that can be done only after budgetary surpluses begin to appear. Of course, the inflationary dangers resulting from the existence of huge amounts of liquid assets could be migrated by shifting to non-bank investors some of the bank-held government securities. But the Treasury's low interest financing policies do not encourage such shifts—quite the contrary.

Thus it becomes imperative to maintain some degree of governmental control over public spending and prices until the supply situation improves and the danger of an inflationary boom in prices of scarce goods is minimized.

As the *Federal Reserve Bulletin* for February points out, if price stability is assured during this critical transition period, the wartime accumulation of liquid assets, "far from being a destructive factor, can help to sustain a high level of employment in future years when the problem may again become one of preventing a deficiency in the level of private demand." On the other hand, if a sharp rise in prices is permitted now, the *Bulletin* warns that the latent purchasing power of all these accumulated liquid

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assets will shrink and the basis for a stable peace-time economy will be undermined.

—Washington Post.

SIX MONTHS IS ENOUGH

O. P. A. is inherently the most dangerous of all the agencies set up for the wartime emergency. Every day that we let it live, now that the war is over, we continue a risk of usurpation of American liberties.

There are those in O. P A., who have no notion of letting wartime controls come to an end, if they can help it. They looked upon the war as a heaven-sent opportunity to start imposing their politico-social ideas on this nation.

We bring no charges against Bowles personally, but it has to be realized that bureau heads are more often than not dependent upon and influenced by individuals under them, especially when these are clever and know just what they want.

These maneuvers involve the artificial creation of shortages, in the hope that O. P. A. will be appealed to to take rationing charge once more of the commodities involved. The clearest current case is that of butter. There is no reason for the present butter famine except government manipulation of prices so that butter making is the least attractive outlet for the dairyman.

The sooner O. P. A. comes safely to an end the safer the American people will be from an insidious attempt to fasten regimentation upon them permanently.

—San Francisco Chronicle

EXTEND PRICE CONTROL DEADLINE NOW

Anyone who thinks the nation is safe from inflation should re-read Chester Bowles' fighting speech before Congress. The inflation boiler, he said, is dangerously near the explosion point, with our entire economic future at stake.

Congress can call the hand of those who are betting on inflation by enacting legislation that will extend price controls for a year beyond the expiration date in June. Unless such legislation is forthcoming, speculators will hold goods back from the market in anticipation of a gigantic break-through on July 1.

We saw a sample of that hoarding prior to January 1, when the speculators expected congress to discontinue price controls.

The important job now is to hold the line until production begins to catch up with buying power. Controls probably can be lifted some time in 1947.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Can we abide by "our pledged word"?

Choice in the Pacific

By Walter Lippmann

From his column "Today and Tomorrow" in The Washington Post

THOUGH peace in the Pacific is still far away, we have made remarkable progress in clarifying and strengthening our own policy. We have made up our minds what it is we do not want and what it is we do want to have happen on the mainland of Asia, and we have, it seems, succeeded in persuading both the Chinese and Russians that this is the best possible arrangement for them as well.

The main points in this development, which began in the autumn, have been a reorganization inside the State Department, the resignation of Ambassador Hurley, a thorough reconsideration of our own military position in China, the Far Eastern discussions at the Moscow conference of Foreign Ministers, a well-planned diplomatic action in Washington and in Chungking, the mission of General Marshall.

What we decided we wanted is a political unification of China so that there might be no civil war in which China would become a gigantic Spain, the Russians backing one faction and we the other. It would have been only too easy to drift, and to be pushed and pulled, into a horrible mess. The administration deserves the highest credit for seeing the danger clearly, and of acting swiftly, skillfully, and sincerely to prevent it.

It is not, I think, too soon to say that they have prevented it. For while there is as yet no certainty that China is out of the woods, it looks very much as if the United States were. We have gotten free of entanglement as the supporters of one of the Chinese parties; we have recovered our historic position as the supporters of China as a whole, and therefore, we are far better able to play our natural and proper role as friendly mediator between China and the Soviet Union.

The next big phase in the establishment of peace will come in the Southern Pacific—in Indo-China and in Indonesia. Though this region is not our primary responsibility, it seems clear that we shall in the end have to participate in the settlement. The British, the French, and the Dutch, separately and collectively, have not sufficient power and moral authority in this turbulent region to bring about a constructive settlement unless in some way or other it is also under-written by the United States. We have the greatest strength within reach of the region and we have a different history in respect to colonies and empire.

But before we can contribute effectively to a settlement, we must clear up the confusion about our own claims in the islands north of

© 1946, by the New York Herald Tribune Syndicate, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the equator. Until this has been cleared, we can make no firm plans about our own armed forces. Moreover, our moral position will be weakened.

It will not be easy to clear up our moral position. For we have gotten ourselves snarled up in a series of conflicting moral principles, thanks to our habit of proclaiming great and high-sounding generalities without stopping to think whether we mean them in concrete cases. Thus we have the first two principles of the Atlantic Charter which, if they mean what they say, should debar us from claiming any new special rights—"no aggrandizement, territorial *or other*"—in any of these islands. We have all the principles of the trusteeship proposals. And we have our own claims, on the ground of national security and by right of the blood shed to conquer the islands, to undisputed domination.

This is very embarrassing, and it does not seem to help much to have Mr. Sumner Welles tell us that the government must "abide by its pledged word". As one who did a lot of pledging, he should get off his high moral horse, and face the fact that we have contradictory pledges. For there is no use pretending that we can observe the spirit or even the letter of the Atlantic Charter, or the spirit of the trusteeship system, and at the same time make the kind of arrangements in these islands which the Navy, the Congress, and the public have been promised.

The best exit from this dilemma would be the wholly honest solution. It would be to say to our allies that these islands are not in the same class with the Philippines, Indo-China, Indonesia, Palestine. The problem of self-government cannot arise in any forseeable time, and therefore the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the trusteeship system do not really apply to them. We should like, therefore, to annex the ones we are sure we need, and then to administer them in the spirit of the United Nations Charter and in order that we may be able to fulfill our responsibilities, which are very great, in stabilizing the peace of the Pacific.

This is not only what we want, it is what our allies are quite willing to let us have. It is what we shall in fact get. The only real question is whether this solution is to be effected hypocritically or sincerely.

The hypocritical solution is to annex the islands by drawing up deeds of trust which make it appear that we have not annexed them. Is there any advantage to anyone in such make-believe? If we get possession of these islands under a deed of trust which permits us to do anything and everything we would do if we had annexed them, I do not think we serve the cause of morality by pretending that we have not.

It means that we must admit that general principles we have proclaimed are not so general as we said they were. It is embarrassing to admit it, and tempting to hide it by inventing a formula which is sheer double talk. For the way to abide by your pledged word is to pledge your word only when you know you can and know you mean to abide by it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Intelligence vs. stupidity in the Democratic party

Party Cleavage

By Jay Franklin

From his column in The Cleveland Plain Dealer

TWO events have highlighted the real and irrepressible issue between the New Dealers and the Old Guard Democrats in Washington: The issue of intelligence versus stupidity.

Despite the circumstances surrounding the resignation of Secretary Ickes, the issue is not the question of honesty or ability, although by and large the New Dealers were honest and able while the usual run of conservative Democrats prefer the flexible ethics of business and the traditional incompetence of party hacks. The real frontier which divides them is the frontier of stupidity. The Old Guard are stupid where the New Dealers were smart —too smart at times for their own good or the comfort of the politicians.

The president's handling of the Pauley incident is almost a classic of political stupidity, because he forced Ickes out, curtly and on short notice, and in so doing alienated the millions of decent people all over the country to whom "Honest Harold" has become an irritating and endearing symbol of forthright integrity and intelligent foresight in handling the public business. That he was right where the State Department was wrong in the matter of giving Hitler helium and giving Japan oil, and that he was right where Jesse Jones was wrong in stockpiling critical materials, are examples of intelligent foresight in political administration. His mistakes were intelligent mistakes and the people never suffered from them. The Pauley business was a stupid mistake because it weakened the administration at a time when it badly needed to be strengthened and for entirely secondary, routine reasons of party convenience.

The other example is, unfortunately, supplied by our foreign policy. This time it is the State Department's heavily documented publication of the charge that the Argentina government was and is an active Axis collaborator, a Fascist regime firmly established in the Western Hemisphere.

Yet, less than a year ago, our then Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., provoked a painful clash with the Soviet Union at the San Francisco conference to organize the United Nations in insisting that Argentina become a member of U.N.O. The Russians urged a delay of 48 hours to study the Argentina credentials. This request was emphatically rejected by Mr. Stettinius, who seems to have been acting under British pressure to assure the United Kingdom access to the food supplies of the

© 1946, by The Consolidated News Features Syndicate, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Argentine. Now, by the action of the State Department itself, it is shown that Mr. Stettinius' policy in this respect was bankrupt.

These two incidents taken together are enough to explain the bitter fight at Chicago for the renomination of Henry Wallace as vice-president. He was entitled to the renomination but was denied it for secondary, routine political considerations. The result was to place Vice-President Truman in the White House when F.D.R. died, and it is Truman who got rid of Ickes in order to support Pauley in an appointment which was politically stupid. After Cordell Hull resigned, the job of secretary of state should have gone to Henry Wallace, by all the rules of politics, since Wallace had made the decisive contribution to the re-election of Roosevelt in 1944. Wallace was denied the job and it was given to Stettinius. And it is Stettinius who brought about the Argentine mess and is the author of this stupid inconsistency in our foreign policy.

It makes the man!

The Brief Case

By Harold Martin

From his column in The Atlanta Constitution

NEW YORK is full of bright young men, all going somewhere in a great hurry, wearing Homburg hats and carrying brief cases. In fact, I myself have been spending the past week carrying a brief case and going somewhere in a great hurry, but I have come to the conclusion I am not as bright as I should be. I have great difficulty remembering whether Madison Avenue is east or west of Fifth and whether 42d street is north or south of 43d. Consequently my progress through the city is interrupted frequently by pauses to ask policemen in which direction is such and such a street, and my progress through the town is thereby greatly slowed down. In fact, I think the next time I come to New York to rush about with a brief case, I will bring a small pocket compass, similar to those the military used to issue in boxes of ten-in-one rations. In that way I can always pause and orient myself, and will not again suffer the embarrassment of suddenly discovering that I have reached the Battery when I fondly thought the bus was carrying me to Central Park South.

I had never before carried a brief case, and I had no idea how a brief case can enhance a man's feeling of importance. A man with a brief

© 1946, by The Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta Georgia

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

case is obviously a man with a mission. If he stops at a busy corner to gawk at a tall building, he does not give the appearance of a rustic visitor overwhelmed by the magnificence of the architecture. He is obviously merely assuring himself that this is the edifice in which he will find the president of a large corporation with whom he soon will be in conference over some colossal financial transaction. Nobody need know that the brief case contains only some old newspaper clippings, a railroad time table, and a pair of socks which got in there by mistake.

There is one danger in carrying a brief case, though, if you are not accustomed to carrying a brief case. You are always getting up after an appointment shaking hands with the man you have been conferring with, and discovering, after you have gone down 34 floors in the elevator, that you have forgotten your brief case, which you left by your chair. Then you have to go back through the whole process again of reporting to the reception desk that you must go back to Mr. So-ond-So's office because you have forgotten your brief case, and she has to call his secretary to tell her that you wish to return because you have forgotten your brief case, and maybe his secretary is away from her desk at the moment, powdering her nose, and it sometimes takes half an hour to retrieve the brief case you did not have any use for in the first place.

I have been doing some figuring and I figure I travel about eight miles a day going to see people, and at least that much again going back after my brief case.

So on Saturday when nobody works, not even book publishers, magazine editors and literary agents, I am going to do what I have wanted to do all along. I am going to leave my brief case at home and I am going to be just a visitor come to town and proud of it. I am going to ride in an open horse-drawn victoria through Central Park, and I am going to peer at the inhabitants of the zoo, and visit the Hayden planetarium to observe the stars in their courses, and take the conducted tour through Radio City, and catch a bus down through Chinatown and do all the other things that visitors do and which New Yorkers never do, because they are too busy rushing about, carrying brief cases.

• One woman in Salt Lake City did the right thing by an unknown man. In a crowded bus she had accidentally brushed against a man standing beside her, leaving a lipstick smudge on his light-colored overcoat.

She called the local newspaper and asked them to explain the situation. "He seemed like such a nice man," she explained. "I wouldn't want his wife to think there was another woman in his life."

• A little girl, visiting a farm for the first time, gazed with great interest at the herd of cows. "Are those American cows?" she asked.

"Of course not, dear," answered her mother. "What makes you think they might be?"

"Well, they never seem to stop chewing," was the answer.

—*Irish News*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

By Jasper R. Lewis

"FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND EXPRESSION"

The First Freedom. By Morris L. Ernst. (Macmillan, $3.00).

Five years ago President Roosevelt, in enumerating the freedoms sought by man, placed first the necessity for freedom of speech and expression. Morris Ernst, who might be called a fighting liberal, calls attention to the dire straits in which this freedom actually finds itself. His creed is that "man's spirit and joy are dependent on the flow of ideas, unrestricted by church, state or controllers of the economic market place." If freedom of thought is essential to a decent standard of living and if brains that are not used disintegrate, then in Germany, where individuals have not been permitted to use their brains for the past score of years, the job of the United Nations resolves itself into the problem of creating individuality.

This book is not, however, a book on the German problem. That suggestion is an aside, or a conclusion to be drawn from the book. The idea is to show the importance of communication and the ability to disseminate ideas. Ernst shows the growth of means of communication from the first crude pictures on stone made by cavemen; then came writers on parchment, which eventually became a kind of church monopoly. The printing press was the atomic bomb of its day, for by it knowledge and ideas could be scattered freely. As the church lost its power, the state gained it; sedition replaced heresy as the crime for distributing ideas antagonistic to the ruling class.

For the cultivation of democracy there are two essential tools: literacy and means of communication. It becomes evident that Ernst, as champion of civil liberties, sees the threat to freedom of communication in the power centered in small groups or in large corporations. He points out, probably with justice, that in the field of education, as in New York City, a small group can restrict the adoption of new ideas in teaching. So in the radio, press and moving picture fields, control rests in the hands of a few giant companies. These are two examples of fettering opinion and information. The meaning of these controls on public thinking is evident, and the author probably echoes the thought of many newspaper readers when he says they have "turned more and more from editorials and news to popular entertainment." That they do not reflect public opinion has been shown in recent election years.

The intensiveness of his views on the subect is shown by the statement that he would exchange the United Nations Charter for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

single act of the conversion of Russia to our concept of freedom of thought and exchange of ideas. There is little danger of Stalin accepting this, but the idea is packed with meaning.

Ernst states that his objective is the hope of stimulating further congressional discussion of the bottlenecks in free thought, the limited ownership of the press, the movies and the radio. This is one of the few times when the reader may disagree with him. Our Congress today is years behind the public, not even abreast. He would have to carry his message to the voters, and how can he do that in the face of these same bottlenecks?

To prove his contentions the author devotes separate chapters to the three idea channels. That on the printed work is pessimistic, although professional writers are aware of the obstacles to a free market. Ernst reviews the growth of newspaper chains, the spread of feature syndicates, and the corresponding decline in the amount of space devoted to original editorials and live news. The magazine field is restricted in the same way, through giant circulations. Only in books does he find a fair opportunity for the dissemination of ideas, probably because of the free competition between publishers for authors.

His chapter on the radio field should make the intelligent reader boil a bit. Not only are the four big networks in control of the most desirable air waves, but their control of patents makes independent operation or improvement almost impossible. Ernst tells stories of abuse of privilege all over the country; when he cites Jesse Jones as an example of one interest blocking the licensing of a new station solely through power, it is a reflection on the electorate of the country, because these things would be impossible if public servants really served the public. Some of the facts are doubtless well known, but it is possible that if the mass of voters realized the broad implications of our radio policy, as set forth here, enough pressure might ensue to cause changes. Meanwhile, there is no actual liberty in the industry, which is a vital part of communications.

As for the movies, Ernst shows how almost from their infancy they have been manipulated and controlled by a small group. For the most part its ambition has been held down to the level of entertainment; educational features have been incidental. Through the self-imposed censorship of the Hays Office, plus the monopoly of the five big companies, it is impossible to procure presentment for any script the producers do not approve. While the financial side of the industry is exposed, with its combines, despotic regulations, etc., Ernst is chiefly concerned with the fact that independent thought and presentation are prohibited; in other words, another field of communication is foreclosed.

Ernst suggests definite separation of these three channels of communication. Another plan would be exemption of limited profits for small firms in these fields, to enable them to become strong competitors of the giants. Changes in postal rates for magazines, favorable to the smaller publications, would help them exist.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Other suggestions are made applying to newspapers, the movies and the radio, all with the same purpose of freeing the sources of information from the control of the few. From the viewpoint of the liberal, some if not all of these ideas would have salutary results. The big thing is the awakening of the public, and for that the means of distributing information should be free.

A more general attitude of liberalism is a selection of essays from the pen of that philosopher, Morris R. Cohen, *The Faith of a Liberal,* (Holt, $3.75). Cohen is a philosopher first, a liberal second; that is, his is the view of the idealist, not of the fighting intellectual who seeks to mend the errors of the day. In this collection, gathered from his writings of the past twenty odd years, appear essays which were originally book reviews of the critical type, and some original material on the same topic of liberalism. The essays are stimulating and exceptionally lucid. They are on as varied topics as Spinoza, Economic Pieties and the Darker Side of Religion. Cohen lists four dangers confronting American liberalism today; one is the shadow of militarism, another the hazard that growth of governmental power may result in dictatorship; a third is the concentration of economic sovereignty in corporate directors. The fourth is the danger that as the result "of the experiences of war, men will tumble wholesale into the folds of those faiths that purport to have the answers to all problems, and that in the warfare between those faiths, or in their union and alliance, the voice of liberalism will be drowned out."

Cohen does not believe that "history is one continuous line of progress, onward and upward." He admits growth and decay; it is evident that he has faith that the upward swing will more than compensate for the downward reactions.

BRIEFER COMMENT

WAR

From the standpoint of powerful writing, *Ward 20,* by Charles Warner Bellah (Doubleday, $2.00), is an outstanding job. Ward 20 is the surgical ward in any military general hospital, and Bellah in this all too brief book portrays the reactions of the maimed veterans to their disabilities. It is told in fictional form, but is stark realism. The attitude of the women nurses, and the actions of the girl friends, professional and otherwise, who are sneaked into the hospital grounds, are pictured in plain, unmistakable language. It is a book that every delegate to the U.N.O. should read and digest, unless he has a queasy stomach. If the U.N.O. takes over that Connecticut site, it may find a copy waiting.

Somewhat belated but excellent is the report of Task Force 39, a cruiser division delegated in 1943 to hold on the Solomons against superior Japanese naval forces. *Night Work,* by Fletcher Pratt (Holt, $300), is a graphic description of battles and the human interest side of the men involved. A touch of humor is added by the inclusion of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American and Japanese radio broadcasts, giving the results of engagements, those of the Japanese showing unlimited imagination on the part of the writers. Some good photographs illustrate the action.

It seems almost as though the author were indulging in plays, to read *The House Near Paris,* by Drue Tartière (Simon & Schuster, $2.75), written with M. R. Werner. Drue Tartière went to London to appear as an actress, but events found her playing a role in the Underground in France. While the book deals with hairbreadth escapes and vital happenings, she has made it a bright narrative of human beings with commonplace thoughts, such as the hidden airmen who could not bear the sight or sound of killing rabbits for a meal. It is excellently done.

BIOGRAPHY

William Bancroft Mellor has made a pleasant biography of *Patton, Fighting Man* (Putman's, $3.00). If not particularly critical and given to praising everything the general did, it tells Patton's life story in an intimate fashion. What most of us overlooked was that Patton was an army man long before he made the headlines in this war, so that his cadet days, time on the Mexican border, and the first World War, all have their part. The slapping incident is narrated but belittled; so many of the boys under Patton also made little of it, and so much admired him, that it is no longer a mark against the late heroic figure, and possibly it receives its proper rating here.

GENERAL INTEREST

Out of the notes and diaries left by her husband, the late Raymond Clapper, Olive Ewing Clapper has made a delightful volume of reminiscences of the New Deal era in *Washington Tapestry* (Whittlesey House, $2.75). While it may contain no deep secrets, it gives a personal slant on many important figures: Coolidge, Hoover, the late President Roosevelt, Wallace and others. It shows many of their foibles; the Clappers were indulgent to weaknesses in the big, but they were not blind to them. That is what makes the book real; it seems a faithful and fair record, and a mighty interesting one.

Another view of inside Washington is presented in *Starling of the White House,* as told to Thomas Sugrue by Colonel Edmund W. Starling (Simon & Schuster, $3.00). Starling's job was guarding our presidents; from Woodrow Wilson, whom he apparently loved, through the administrations of Harding, Coolidge and Hoover to F. D. R., he saw the procession of public figures and the domestic lives of the presidential families. There are many amusing incidents, side looks at big events, and a wealth of memoirs that make the book of decided value.

The business of being a supervisor is diagrammed and footnoted in *Supervising People,* by George D. Halsey (Harper's, $3.00). This includes such fundamentals as understanding human behavior, making people like you, rating personnel, etc. It will be a useful volume for those who are burdened

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with personnel work, although from my own limited experience with personnel directors I am prejudiced in favor of fewer rules as measuring sticks and more acquaintance.

FICTION

One of the best pieces of fiction of the year is *The Foxes of Harrow,* by Frank Yerby, (Dial, $3.00). It is the life of Stephen Fox, a newcomer in New Orleans in 1825, and his rise up the ladder to plantation (Harrow) and steamboat owner, his sentimental adventures, and the aftermath of his success reflected in the lives of his children. It is an historical novel of Louisiana, culminating in the tragedies of the Civil War. None of the separate situations seem new, but Yerby has woven their pattern into a whole that makes better-than-average reading.

If you like Biblical stories or even if you don't, you will find *David the King,* by Gladys Schmitt (Dial, $3.00), interesting and revealing of the times of Saul and his successor. The love interests (plural, please) are there, the battles with the Philistines and the Bedouins, and the episode of Bath-sheba. It is strange how the same carryings-on in modern novels require more explicit phrasing; Miss Schmitt writes frankly but with decency, and the result is a praiseworthy and better book.

Hailed as the winner of the Doubleday, Doran $20,000 Prize Novel for 1945, and also of the M-G-M $125,000 award, *Before the Sun Goes Down,* by Elizabeth Metzger Howard (Doubleday, $2.75), seems to be well paid for. It is the story of a little town in Pennsylvania in the 1880's, a doctor's unexpressed lifetime love for the unobtainable, the division of the families on the two sides of the tracks, and the trend toward a converging of the later generations. Everyone in it is talkative, and much of it is sentimental cold pudding. In other words it should be popular.

Man of Brittany, by Selwyn James (Simon & Schuster, $2.50), is a well written novel of the war. The Man of Brittany is the hunted Breton farmer who has disposed of a German officer, and thereafter is a leader in the French resistance. The story deals with basic loves and hates, and the ultimate desirability of cooperation between individuals to a common end.

Seven Soviet Plays, with Introductions by H. W. L. Dana, (Macmillan, $4.00), is a collection of recent works done into English by several translators. It is intended to show that the Russian people were being prepared for the German invasion, but whether it does this or not, it reflects the Russian mode of living and particularly the Russian mental attitude. One piece, *Field Marshal Kutusov,* is in blank verse and is a stirring drama of the Napoleonic invasion in 1812. All naturally glorify the Russian spirit, and those plays based in current events are eulogistic of Soviet policies and ideals.

●Nothing is as short as the public memory . . . it is little more than week-minded.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Theatre Arts

By John Gassner

THE most recent events in the theatre have been more interesting than successful, the interest residing in the straining for expressiveness rather than in the achievement. A short-sighted view would tend to dismiss such work with bright epigrams; there is a type of derogatory criticism that is fun for both the critic and his readers because it massages their respective self-esteem. It is always possible to turn failure into a Roman holiday with the critic's wit performing cartwheels, and perhaps this is what we mean by urbane criticism. Then there is, of course, the dyspeptic approach which loses sight of anything but the fact of failure and feeds on indignation. This butters no plays but it can enhance a critic's reputation for sagacity and integrity.

In no department of contemporary culture are such attitudes more pronounced and less realistic than in the theatre. The fact is that the stage experiments more than most of the arts, and yet more than any of them does so under difficult conditions and can be called to account because, being dependent on spoken dialogue unlike music and ballet, it commits itself concretely to a story and a viewpoint.

Being a slow-motion technic by comparison with motion pictures, its efforts can be assayed clearly. The rapid movement of pictures on a screen induces a mild state of hypnosis which allays or saponifies criticism. Each of a film's 250 or so "shots" cannot be subjected to the same scrutiny as the stage play's handful of scenes set against a static background.

Since the stage reflects the trend toward dissociation in contemporary life, as well as the penumbrally Gothic or dynamically muddled nature of post-classic Western art, it often messes up what it touches. What is more, the mess is conspicuous and closely observable. And yet this is also, in a sense, the measure of the theatre's interest for our times: its struggle and defeat epitomize the living essence of the age, reflect its writhings on the actual and imaginative plane, project what Blake would have termed the "mental fight"—a fight in which, to borrow from another poet, ignorant armies clash by night.

These reflections are induced by such recent productions as Jean Anouilh's *Antigone* (adapted by Lewis Galantiere, performed by the redoubtable Katherine Cornell and Sir Cedric Hardwicke), Maxwell Anderson's *Truckline Cafe* (produced, in association with the Playwrights' Company, by Elia Kazan and Harold Clurman, directed by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the penetrative Mr. Clurman), and Robert Ardrey's *Jeb* (produced and directed by the able Herman Shumlin). The same analysis could be imposed on recent minor efforts, if a critic likes to break butterflies on wheels, and on previously reviewed plays like *Deep Are the Roots, The Magnificent Yankee* and *Dream Girl*. But *Antigone, Truckline Cafe* and *Jeb* will have to suffice for the present.

Antigone was originally produced during the German occupation of Paris, and the fact that it could be staged at that time indicates that the French text must have indulged in double-talk. It must have meant one thing to the Parisians and another to Nazi officialdom. But this is an oversimplification. The play's schizoid character reflects our own. Not only were two principles —democracy and totalitarianism— in collision when the work was written, but the French themselves were politically and emotionally schizoid. Moreover, the playwright could go back to the Greece of Sophocles, the first dramatist who wrote an extant *Antigone*. There, too, it was necessary to mediate between the rival claims of the individual conscience and the demands of the state. And there have been few periods of history, if any, after the fifth century B. C. when this conflict was successfully resolved. Perhaps it is this fact that accounts for the fascination of the Antigone theme. During the occupation of France this theme was merely accentuated, and it may be accentuated again before long.

It is plain, however, that the dramatist has a different function than the historian. It is not sufficient for the former to reflect the confusions and conflicts of his time. He is a constructor, and must resolve the unresolved in accordance with an ideal; otherwise his work is chaotic and confusing. If his ideal happens to be justice, integrity and the right to private conscience, he must present his viewpoint without equivocation. This is precisely what Anouilh has failed to do. And, curiously enough, neither the adapter nor the producer succeeded in correcting the playwright's fuzzy treatment; which is what they were free to do, whereas Anouilh could expect some indulgence from us because there was no political freedom in Paris.

In the current *Antigone* the dice are so heavily loaded that the tyrant Creon becomes a man of good will and sound intelligence while Antigone becomes an obstinate girl bereft of her senses by the force of her obsession. The brother she has buried at the risk of her life was a worthless prodigal, an impetuous fool, a very real threat to his country, a fratricide, and a would-be parricide who conspired to assassinate Oedipus! You might as well sentimentalize over Lord Haw-Haw as over Polyneices. Creon has refused him burial as a public example in a period of national emergency. And if this isn't enough to discredit Antigone's case, Creon makes it plain that it is impossible to tell whether the unburied body actually belonged to Polyneices. Creon, moreover, gives Antigone every opportunity to escape punishment, shows her every consideration, and tries to sway her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with very convincing, well-written dialogue.

Antigone makes no answer to his argument worthy of any proponent of democracy. She can only articulate a contempt for all expediency, which is a negation of statecraft and fails to take into account the merest shadow of reality. Antigone, it is not too much to say, is neither a well realized dramatic character nor an adequate symbol of democratic idealism. Nor does anyone else in the play speak rationally for Antigone or the principle she supposedly represents. When tragedy comes to Creon, the tyrant, his fate seems far from justified. When Antigone disappears from the scene we can only feel relieved of the presence of the beautiful, neurotic and futile bore.

The voice of the French resistance movement, supposedly sounded by Anouilh, turns out to be cachinations of a disembodied spirit. If *Antigone* has any significance for us, it is as a symptom of a continuing confusion in the thought and action of the democracies. The Guthrie McClintic production, which is beautifully ordered and enjoys the loveliness of Katherine Cornell and the masterful personality and performance of Cedric Hardwicke, only highlights the failure. And this is a pity, because Anouilh can write mangnificently, witness Creon's speeches, and because there is unique creativeness in several of the scenes.

Robert Ardrey's *Jeb* is the story of a Southern Negro war veteran. The Army taught him a white man's trade, operating an adding machine. He insists upon plying his trade. This threatens the doctrine of white supremacy. A white supervisor tries to give him the job, and to save him from making a false step. The result is a near-lynching. These are the main ingredients of a worthy play, with Jeb Turner sympathetically played by Ossie Davis, with Santos Ortega giving a superb performance as the supervisor, and with some powerful direction by Herman Shumlin. Nevertheless, *Jeb* fell decidedly short of the author's intention, and the reasons for failure are not entirely located in the diffuse organization of the play.

Like so many liberal-minded people Robert Ardrey holds principles but has only a tenuous hold on reality. Reality in this case is character. Ardrey's *Jeb* is not a man but a symbol. As a man Jeb would not have returned to the deep South with as naive an ignorance of racial discrimination. As a fully realized character, he would not have been merely obsessed with the idea of operating an adding machine. Poor Jeb is a clinical case rather than a representative of his race; he talks and acts like someone under the influence of drugs. With the exception of the supervisor, the white men are equally shadowy. They are white attitudes, not white people. In short, the Negro is a cause and not a people for the author; and the South for him, is merely a state of mind. A corollary effect is that even the race issue has no dramatic reality in this play in spite of the best intentions and the efforts of an able dramatist.

Our final example is Maxwell Anderson's *Truckline Cafe,* which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was unanimously excoriated by the New York press and evoked a rejoinder from the producers Elia Kazan and Harold Clurman denouncing the critics. The producers have a point in challenging the right of a handful of scribes to determine the fate of a play. The reviewers have a point in claiming that they must report their impressions honestly regardless of the consequences, and that it is up to the public to accept or reject their views. There is no room here to examine the argument more closely. It is unfortunate only that the producers chose so poor a play to exemplify their case. Anyone who tried to decide the merits of the litigation on the basis of *Truckline Cafe* would have to award the palm to the critics.

The controversy, however, is important as a symptom of the kind of schizoid creativeness which brings forth a *Truckline Cafe*. In a diner cafe on the ocean highway between Los Angeles and San Francisco, ex-soldiers and their women are engaged in various activities ranging from comedy to melodrama. Some of them are mildly troubled, defiant or disillusioned, but two couples carry the thread of whatever plot there is. One of them is headed for tragedy, one for reconciliation. A woman, who believed her soldier husband to have been killed in Germany, lived with another man out of loneliness and was carrying a child. Upon learning that her husband was alive she did away with the child and ran away. The husband tracks her down and allays her sense of guilt by revealing that he, too, was unfaithful; he lived with a Polish prisoner who died, and he has brought their child to America. The wife cannot make up her mind to return to him; didn't she do away with her own child out of loyalty to him, etc. She realizes the importance of healing all rifts by forgiving and forgetting only when another ex-soldier kills his erring wife after piecing together the evidence of her infidelity.

This story is submerged in irrelevant action, is not told well, and lumbers along creakily. The coincidences are plentiful, the plot is contrived, the wordage is long, as well as now and then pretentious. The whole business smacks of old-hat melodrama. But here's the rub! Surely the author was not consciously writing such sorry stuff for its own sake. What led the famous Mr. Anderson to write such a play and the brilliant Messrs. Kazan and Clurman to produce it and to want to defend it to the death? Simply this: the play is supposed to exist on two planes, the actual and the symbolical. The play, in short, is intended as a parable or allegory; it is supposed to represent the post-war chaos, the need to knit up the ravelled sleeve of war-torn humanity, the imperativeness of reconciling antagonisms, healing wounds, and building a sane way of life.

Does the play exemplify this worthy idea? The author and the producers think it does. But the plane of actuality is so unsatisfactory in this drama that it requires an act of faith or mental acrobatics to arrive at the symbol. The actual plane is a mess; the symbolic one cannot therefore be less of a mess, unless we substitute far-fetched ra-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tionalizations for what actually transpires on the stage. This rationalization is an old trick of inadequate thinking and creativeness. What it strongly suggests is that, like others in our times, the creators are befuddled. More than that, they stand between reality and dreamfulness. The reality is weak; the dream is muddied. The result is confusion twice compounded. Once compounded (!) would be enough to kill a play on the boards. Clurman's fine bits of direction, like Anderson's fine little vignettes, cannot overcome this unfortunate state of affairs, even with the aid of excellent performances by Marlon Brando, Joann Dolan and Karl Malden. It is possible to appreciate fragments of the production and the play, to applaud them even. But it is impossible to take away with one any sense of an orderly experience or perception; and this is the ultimate, the determining, test of a play's quality.

To conclude, the plays we have discussed suffer from a failure of orientation as well as execution. Much of their interest and their few merits reside in this failure.

•Young people today are alike in many disrespects.

—Phoenix Flame

•The new minister was enthusiastic about foreign missions, and one of his first tasks was to call upon parishioners whom he knew to have money and enlist their support.

"I'm sorry," replied one wealthy farmer, "but it's no use asking me. I don't approve of foreign missions."

"But surely," the minister persisted, "you know that we are commanded to feed the hungry."

"That may be," came the grim reply, "but can't we feed'em on something cheaper than missionaries?"

•"Doctor," growled the man who had been put on a diet, "why do you always order a fellow to cut out the things he likes?"

"Because," snapped the doctor, "he never eats or drinks the things he doesn't like, so it must stand to reason it must be the things he does like that are disagreeing with him."

—Watchman-Examiner

TRENDS OF THE TIME

•The government is pricing B-29's at $350 each (1/100 of 1 per cent of original cost) for educational institutions for dormitory use. The catch: the buyers must figure out how to get the planes from the nearest airport with a 5000 foot runway.

•And a Los Angeles census taker reports that two persons are permanent lodgers in the Union Station waiting room.

•The governor of North Carolina, R. Greeg Cherry, received a request from Lt. Colonel T. W. Bruton, his former assistant attorney general, for "one ship for transportation home at once."

Replied the governor: "This state is fresh out of navies, but I'll be glad to send you a log. As an old log-roller, you should be able to do something with that."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HIGHLIGHTI

The International Scene

Currently the world is wondering where security ends and expansion begins. All except Russia, that is. We wonder just how large a periphery of security the Red diplomats feel is necessary to guard the Soviet Union against "any eventuality." In the last few years, the Soviet Union has annexed Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, eastern Poland, Besserabia and Bukovina, Moldavia, Carpatho-Ukraine, East Prussia, parts of Finland and Central Asia, southern Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands—a total population of about 24,000,000. Friendly gestures have been made toward Czechoslovakia, Outer Mongolia, the Balkan countries and the East Indies. Naval bases and railroad privileges in Manchuria have been acquired. All this in the name of security. Now Russia is clamoring for parts of Iran and Turkey and resents Anglo-American curtailment of her influence in the Balkans.

DEADLINE OVERLOOKED

March 2, 1946, came and went and still Russian troops remained in Iran. According to the British-Soviet-Iran treaty of 1942, Allied forces were to be withdrawn from Iran six months after the conclusion of an armistice between Germany and the Allies, namely March 2. By that time all of the American forces and most of the British were gone. The Soviet Union, however, made an announcement: some of its forces would be withdrawn starting immediately but the rest would be kept in some parts of Iran "until the situation has been elucidated." Ten days later word came through that not only were Russian troops not moving out, but that more were moving into Iran. These troops were concentrating near Tabriz in Azerbaijan and were reported to be moving west toward Turkey. Turkey meanwhile feared a Russian-inspired uprising to create an independent Kurdish kingdom out of parts of Iran, Iraq and Turkey.

Unless Russia and Iran settle their differences, without pressure on the smaller country, the matter will be brought up before the U.N.O. Security Council once more in its first New York meeting, it was disclosed in Washington on March 15. If Iran does not introduce the subject, the United States will. Secretary of State Byrnes dispatched a note to the Soviet government on March 5 protesting the retention of Russian troops in Iran.

On the same day Byrnes lodged another formal protest over the activities of the Soviet Union. This second note questioned the continued presence of Soviet troops in Manchuria six weeks after they were to have been evacuated under the terms of the Russian-Chinese treaty of August, 1945; the Russian practice of stripping Manchurian mines and factories; and the Russian proposal to Chungking that China and Russia should jointly administer Manchuria's industries.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Besides Soviet activities in Manchuria and Iran, American-Russian relations were further strained by political conflict in Bulgaria. According to the United States, the (Soviet-sponsored) Bulgarian government has not lived up to the terms of the Big Three Moscow agreement providing for the broadening of the government by the inclusion of representatives of opposing democratic groups. Secretary of State Byrnes sent a note to this effect to the Bulgarian government and requested the addition of two "truly representative" members of the opposition in the coalition government, rather than two candidates without regard to the "condition of their participation." Unlike the two notes sent to the Soviet government, this note brought a prompt reply from the Kremlin. The Russian government accused the United States of violating the Moscow agreement by her unilateral action suggesting "new conditions" for the broadening of the Bulgarian government.

PLAIN TALK

On the Campus of Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri, (March 5), the ex-Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, spoke his mind. "Neither the sure prevention of war nor the continuous rise of world organization will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples", namely the United States and the British Empire. This must be done to counteract "the expansive and proselytizing tendencies" of the Soviet Union. "I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. What they do desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their powers and doctrines." He painted a dark picture of post-war Europe and the "iron curtain" which divides it. "This is certainly not the liberated Europe we fought to build up. Nor is it one which contains the essentials of permanent peace."

Reaction to Churchill's verbal attack on Russia and to his bid for an Anglo-American alliance was immediate and widespread. Secretary of Commerce Wallace and Senator Pepper called it "shocking." The *London Times* thought it was a mistake to present western democracy and communism as "irreconcilable." Others welcomed a "get tough" attitude toward Russia. Few, however, endorsed the idea of a fraternal association for Britain and the United States.

Premier Joseph Stalin of the Soviet Union had no kind words to say about Churchill and his views. In a statement issued in Moscow on March 13, Stalin denounced the Britisher as a Hitler-like "warmonger" seeking to set off an armed conflict with the Soviet Union. The speech, moreover, was a "dangerous act" designed to impede collaboration among the war-time Allies and "incompatible with the Anglo-Soviet treaty of alliance." Stalin particularly resented the inference that the English-speaking peoples should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decide the fortunes of the whole world.

The plain talk of this tense international conversation was not completed with Stalin's statement. As an answer, Winston Churchill repeated the statements he previously made at an official dinner in New York.

SHADES OF FASCISM

The pressure on Generalissimo Francisco Franco's government was gently but firmly increased from all sides. The United Nations General Assembly renewed an anti-Franco policy by unanimously adopting a resolution formally condemning the Franco regime in Spain and once more forbidding Spain membership in the U.N.O. From across the Pyrenees, the French government slammed a door in Franco's face by closing her frontier with Spain. But the biggest blow came on March 4 when France, Great Britain and the United States appealed to the people of Spain to oust Franco. Simultaneously Washington, Paris and London made public captured documents, including signed letters by Franco himself, which proved the Spanish dictator a constant Axis collaborator. Moreover, the "indictment" stated that Franco had not entered the war because of cowardice, unprepardness and failure to achieve his demands for economic and military assistance and post-war territorial aggrandizement. The three Western democracies expressed the hope that the Spanish people, without being subjected to the "horrors and bitterness of civil strife," could set up an "interim or caretaker government" to rule until they could freely determine the kind of government they want.

—Lambert in The Chicago Sun
"TATTLETALE GRAY"

Spanish criticism came from all factions. Franco was ready with his comments 24 hours before the three-power appeal was made to his people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He voiced defiance of foreign "intervention": "Spain repudiates any foreign pressure put upon her since it considers that the question of its interior regime concerns exclusively its own sovereignty" and warned that intervention would only "serve to heighten the national feelings of the Spanish people" (civil war). And to most of the Spanish people the price of another civil war would be too high for the ousting of Franco. On the other side of the Pyrenees came more criticism. Dr. José Giral, Premier of the Spanish Republican Government in Exile, issued a statement in Paris in which he expressed disappointment over the tripartite anti-Franco declaration. The resolution did not go far enough. The only peaceful means of ejecting Franco, Dr. Giral says, is by breaking diplomatic relations with his government and recognizing the Spanish Republicans. Like Franco, Don Juan, pretender to the Spanish throne, thought ill of the declaration. He regarded the proposal as an "intolerable" intervention by foreign powers in Spain's internal affairs.

NORTHERN SPIES

On February 15, Prime Minister W. L. Mackenzie King calmly announced that a Royal Commission had been appointed to investigate disclosure of secret and confidential information to unauthorized persons, including some members of a foreign mission. The public suspected a spy thriller and implications mounted quickly. The foreign mission was identified as that of the Soviet Union and the confidential information, atomic energy. Five days after Prime Minister Mackenzie King's revelation, an official statement came from Moscow. The Soviet Union acknowledged that it was the power named in the inquiry that had obtained "secret data" on atomic energy and radar in Canada but asserted that this information was "unimportant" because it was found in a public work. The announcement revealed also that information had been obtained by the Soviet military attaché in Ottawa from Canadians "friendly disposed" to the Soviet Union and that the attaché had been recalled. Soviet criticism went further. An "unbridled anti-Soviet campaign" by the Canadian press and radio "aimed at inflicting political harm to the Soviet Union"—the whole procedure "not compatible with friendly relations" between the Soviet Union and Canada.

ARGENTINE IMPASSE

The United States staked great hopes in the results of the presidential election in Argentina. The recent publication of the Blue Book was timed for its effect on the Argentine people in the hope that the revelation of the past activities of the Perón government would affect the national vote. On February 24, about 3,000,000 voters (out of a possible 3,500,000 people registered) participated in one of the most peaceful and uneventful major election in Argentine history. They were deciding who should be President for the next normal term, six years. Opposing each other were Dr. José P. Tamborini, candidate for the Democratic Union, (composed of Radicals, Progressive Democrats, Socialists and Communists), and Juan Domingo Perón, candidate for the Labor party. Although the results were slow in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coming in, before long, Senor Perón established a substantial, and irrevocable, lead. The United States was doomed to disappointment and a set-back in prestige in South America. An all-out policy of getting rid of Argentina's strong man, whom Washington accuses of being a Nazi collaborator and desirous of establishing a Nazi type of state in the Western Hemisphere, has not been successful.

As a result of the strained United States-Argentine relations, the conference of American states scheduled for Rio de Janeiro between March 15 and April 15 was postponed by the Pan American Union. The purpose of the conference was the drawing up of a military treaty, which the United States refuses to sign with Argentina under current political conditions in that country. Whether or not a military treaty will be drawn up through normal diplomatic channels remains to be seen. Meanwhile a regular Pan American Conference is scheduled to be held in Bogotá, Colombia, in December.

A CHANGE OF HEART

The tone of the Japanese Constitution has been changed. Where Emperor Meiji's Constitution of 1889 had stated, "We (the Emperor) have inherited from Our Ancestors the rights of sovereignty," the present constitution reads, "We the Japanese people . . . do proclaim the sovereignty of the people's will." The American pattern had been substituted for the German, which, in 1946, is not in good taste.

With the good wishes of General MacArthur, the Japanese government on March 6 made public a draft of the new Japanese Constitution. It embodied the renunciation of war "forever" and the prohibition of the maintenance by the Japanese Empire of an army, navy or air force. Further, it re-defined the powers of the Emperor, established a "Bill of Rights" and provided for the abolition of the House of Peers. The new Constitution will be submitted at the next session of the Diet following the general elections in April.

NEW BLOOD

In a colorful and impressive ceremony during the week of February 18, 32 new Cardinals were given their scarlett birettas by Pope Pius XII. From 19 countries the prelates had journeyed to Rome for the occasion and for the five days of public pageantry and secret meetings which marked the Catholic Church's first Consistory since 1940. The Italian members of the Sacred College are now outnumbered for the first time in six centuries. This shift in emphasis from Italian to international was accompanied by a recognition of the growing importance of the Catholic Church in the United States. Since the death of William Cardinal O'Connell of Boston, the only Cardinal in the United States was Dennis Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia. Now four more have been added: Archbishops Francis J. Spellman of New York, John J. Glennon of St. Louis (who died in Dublin on his way home 15 days after the ceremonies), Samuel A. Stritch of Chicago and Edward Mooney of Detroit.

During the course of the week the Pope made one of the most signifi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cant speeches of his pontificate. Modern imperialism, he declared, "carries in it germs which endanger the very foundations of human intercourse." Stressing again and again the "supranationalism" of a universal church, the Pontiff called upon the Roman Catholic Church to take the leadership in preparing a basis on which human society "can rest securely." By implication, communism in general and the Soviet Union in particular bore the brunt of his words. He condemned "an unbridled tendency toward expansion," the all-powerful state that reduces individuals to the "humiliating status of a formless mass." The speech was, in the eyes of many observers, a call to stand against communist doctrine and to strengthen the Church in all countries.

LEFT OR RIGHT

On February 17 in the first general election since 1939, the Belgian people turned to the right and to the left, and, as one experienced analyst expressed it, let the bottom drop out of the middle. The election marked the collapse of the middle-of-the-road Liberal party and a new demonstration of power by the royalist conservative Christian Social party: Liberals—17, Christian Social—92, Communists—23, Socialists—68. Moreover, the election led to a political impasse, with the Left and Right blocs in Parliament almost equally balanced.

On the basis of the return, Premier Achille van Acker and his government resigned. Then on March 11, after three weeks of political jockeying, a new Cabinet, predominantly Socialist, was formed. Paul-Henri Spaak became the Premier, adding this new position to his other one, the Foreign Ministry, but he himself admitted that the life expectancy of his government would not be long. Its primary rôle, it is assumed, is to clear up the issues dividing the major parties and to pave the way for the formation of a more stable administration. One of these issues is the return of King Leopold, who is patiently waiting abroad for a national referendum which would call him home. From all indications, the spurned monarch is destined for a long wait.

The Domestic Scene

The vision of peace has been with us for six months. Whether she was to be a temporary visitor or a permanent member of the household only future events could determine. Her bare presence was here; her luggage has not yet arrived. The squabbles within the house and the neighborhood fights might force her soon to move on.

But, while the neighborhood was far from peaceful, the household settled down to accept the presence of peace. No longer were new and startling domestic events bursting forth daily in the headlines. Life became the hum-drum business of everyday things. In the past month Washington and the nation finished up many odds and ends. Only a few items remained in the "unfinished business" basket.

Within a few weeks the number idle because of strikes dropped precipitately from 1,750,000 to 300,000. March 13 was V-S Day on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

industrial battlefield, but some new fighting was due soon.

On that date two of the main disputes passed into history—General Motors and General Electric signed with their respective unions. The end of the G.M. strike closed the 113-day-old battle between the mightiest industrial and labor giants in the world, and marked the end of the longest and most costly strike in automotive history. The deadlock was broken after a final session of 17 consecutive hours of negotiations.

On the debit side, both titans were in the red. The corporation was reported to have lost $1,000,000,000, although a major portion of this will be given back to it in the form of tax refunds. The workers had spent most of their savings and were in such dire straits that state and national money-raising campaigns were instituted to provide relief for the strikers and their families. It has been estimated that it will take the workers 104 weeks to make up what they lost during the strike.

WHO WON?

As for the "winnah" in the fight, both sides seemed happy. The union had been holding out for a 19½-cents-an-hour pay boost; the company was adamant in its stand that it was 18½ or nothing. It was 18½, which figure was just about half of amount demanded originally by the union. The good old haggling technique of asking for twice as much as you expect and then settling for half seemed to operate in this case. The new pay scale lifted the average base pay from $1.12 an hour to $1.30½. The net take-home pay will, however, be less than it was during the war years, because, although the hourly wage is increased, the work week dropped from 48 to 40 hours.

Yet the United Auto Workers hailed the settlement as "a victory for the whole American people because the G. M. strikers have fought and won their price battle." The union stated that the strikers had started their walkout "on the promise of wage increases without price increases. They have held to that position. Under the present wage-price policy of the government, a price increase in General Motors products cannot be justified on the basis of the flat increase won in hourly rates and other economic gains included in the proposed strike settlement."

The union maintained that "the 18½-cent wage increase, plus the agreement to remove inequities in wage rates, meets the 19½-cent increase recommended by President Truman." Other gains included improved vacation pay and improved overtime rates for seven days continuous operations.

Also settled on the same day was the 57-day strike of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America (C.I.O.) and General Electric. The settlement was on the basis of the familiar and unoriginal 18½ cents per hour. The union, however, still has to deal with Westinghouse, who may soon be forced to settle if its G.E. competitor starts full production.

OH, NO, JOHN, NO, JOHN, NO, JOHN, NO!

Yet the traditional rain cloud was to be seen on the spring horizon. May flowers are not the only contributions of April showers. Every April

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fool's Day, the soft coal operators watch their contract with John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers pass into oblivion. The event is seldom a surprise to anybody, since some time in the first week of March the traditional strike notice is filed and negotiations for a new contract start. A rare April passes when the negotiations are not deadlocked and the annual strike called.

This year's demands resemble strongly those of last year. The union is again asking for a welfare royalty fund of 10 cents on every ton of coal, for the same pay for a five-day week as the workers now receive for six-days, and for unionization of supervisory employees. Whether they will have more success than greeted them last year only future events can say.

The operators seem agreed upon some pay concessions if the increase will not so increase the price of coal that only gas and oil producers will benefit. Even the 35-hour week is not anathema to them. There seems to be a feeling that the miners' welfare fund might be granted if the union promises to end wildcat strikes.

But on the subject of unionizing the foremen, the answer is an unequivocal NO.

This issue has recently been brought to the public's attention by a ruling of the National Labor Relations Board. Last year the N.L.R.B., in the Packard case, decided that foremen could join the Independent Foremen's Association of America, but left undecided whether foremen could join workers' unions. On March 7, however, by a two-to-one decision, the board upheld the right of foremen to join production workers' unions. There are indications that the Supreme Court will soon be asked to decide the issue, and until that time, the coal operators appear ready to fight.

The negotiations opened in a stormy atmosphere, and, after a week, the operators accused Lewis of "filibustering" and wasting 20 per cent of the time set aside for negotiations. He gave a mine-by-mine recitation of unsavory conditions, charging that "the industry extorts annually from the pay envelopes of the mine workers sixty million dollars for pseudo-hypothetical and substandard medical care, hospitalization and insurance of an actual value of less than one-third of the aforesaid sixty million dollars." He accused the operators of practicing "extortion from the cradle to the grave" and claimed that the owners profited "from the time the child is born until his corpse is laid away."

Lewis magnanimously said that he recognized the "impatience" of the operators on listening to the recital by the miners, and saw that "their souls are tortured on hearing the facts. But you asked for it. So take it." The fact that the stories were "repetitious and boresome," he said, was "a matter of no damn consequence to us at all."

FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH

Events on the international scene made this country's labor pains seem like a Sunday school picnic. Returning from the first session of the United Nations Assembly, two statesmen endeavored to tell the public what the world situation was all about, in case it hadn't formed its own opinions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first report came from Senator Vandenberg, who reported to his colleagues on his impressions of the London meeting. His address on February 27 did not once mention Secretary of State Byrnes' name; he gave the impression that he was not even at the Assembly. The Michigan Senator, former isolationist, called for a more vigorous foreign policy and while maintaining that the future of the U.N.O. depends upon the ability of the United States and Russia to learn to live together in mutual understanding, he urged that this country match Russia in candor and firmness in foreign affairs.

The following day, Brynes laid down the principles of this country's foreign policy. Any deviation from them now would be painfully clear, and events in the Near East would be their first test.

Russia received a clear warning from Byrnes. "We will not and we cannot stand aloof if force or the threat of force is used contrary to the purposes and principles of the Atlantic Charter." He asserted that "if we are to be a great power we must act as a great power . . .Our diplomacy must not be negative and inert."

Following the speech, Byrnes received a cablegram labelled "top secret": "Congratulations. Blimey, chum, them is my sentiments. Bevin."

BREAD UPON THE WATERS

To the White House one day in March went 71-year old Herbert Hoover and 12 other prominent citizens. Called by President Truman, they were given the job of formulating a program whereby Europe would not starve and America would not face the prospect of rationed food. The group agreed upon voluntarily restricted consumption by this country. Hotels and restaurants were asked not to give diners rolls and bread before serving the meal, in an attempt to halt the American custom of nibbling while impatiently trying to catch the waiter's eye.

The committee reported: "The facts as presented showed deficiencies in food supplies that threaten death by starvation to untold millions in other lands. The facts show this country to be the principal hope for salvation. The facts also show an increase in food consumption in this country of substantial proportions above the pre-war years."

The nation was urged to cut wheat consumption by 25 per cent, and "conservation of food oils and fats now going on should be increased in every possible way."

Everybody seemed agreed that ex-President Hoover was the man for the job. Following the last war he had supervised the feeding of millions in Eastern and Central Europe and became, next to President Wilson, the best known American in Europe. He will now undertake another food mission to Europe, and his findings will be the major factor in determining how far this country's food consumption must be cut to avert mass starvation across the seas. His 30-day tour of the continent is expected to take him to all major countries.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is dubious whether the system of voluntary rationing will work. It won't be easy for this country to abstain voluntarily. When food is available, we aren't conditioned to resisting it. President Truman's Famine Emergency Committee will have to contend with the human feeling that "The idea is fine, but what difference will my nibbling have on the world?"

—*Shoemaker in The Chicago Daily News*

"LET ME CALL YOU SWEETHEART"

NOT EVEN A FOXHOLE

The split between the White House and Capitol Hill grew wider this month as Congress put the axe to or diluted many administration measures. The hopelessness of the executive could be summed up in the petulant reply of President Truman to a reporter's query about the fate of the universal military training bill. He pointed out that he had done everything he possibly could, including a personally delivered message of recommendation to Congress, but he couldn't order that body to pass it.

The administration-congressional deadlock was vividly revealed in the fight over housing. Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt had evolved a comprehensive building plan for the construction in two years of 2,700,000 new houses to cost $6,000 or less and to rent for not more than $50 monthly. The building-material shortages make a tight bottle-neck which the administration proposes to smash by getting Congress to approve a $600,000,000 appropriation for subsidy payments to manufacturers of critical supplies to stimulate production at present price levels.

The Patman bill was thus submitted to the tender mercies of the House, But no, thanks, the House wasn't having any. The ever-faithful coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans turned thumbs down on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1) the allocation of $600,000,000 for subsidies and (2) price ceilings on existing homes, and thus tore out what Wyatt called "the heart of the building program." The administration plans to carry to the Senate the fight to restore subsidies. But there is no indication that the powerful real estate lobby will be less energetic there than it was in the House. In the housing fight, statesmanship gave way to estatesmanship.

WHOSE BABY?

There was no doubt that the United States had the major control of the atomic bomb and its intricate production processes. The question before the nation, however, was "What are you going to do about it?" The May-Johnson Bill, giving primary control to the military, received its death blow when President Truman announced that he favored civil control over atomic production and use. Most of the nation agreed with him, feeling, to paraphrase Clemenceau, that "atomic energy is too serious a matter to be left to the Generals and Admirals."

But it could not be denied that the Army and Navy should have some say in the matter of atomic control. The disputed point was how much, and in what form this say should be exercised.

The Senate Atomic Energy Committee, considering the McMahon Bill, thought it had the answer. The original bill provided for no military voice of consultation. By a vote of 10-to-1, with the bill's sponsor, Senator McMahon of Connecticut, casting the dissenting ballot, the committee agreed to an amendment proposed by Senator Vandenberg which would have established a military board to work with the Atomic Control Commission.

This seemed to be a fairly-well worked-out compromise. The military board would know what was going on, could acquaint the commission with its views, and yet a civilian, the president, would have final say in any disputed matters. But Senator McMahon felt that the board should be limited strictly to problems affecting only the "military application of atomic energy," and considered that the broad phrase "national defense and security" gave the brass hats undue influence

Senator Vandenberg stressed the fact that the board would have no affirmative powers. He thought that the armed forces would have considerably less influence in the proposed board than they would if they obtained minority membership on the commission itself.

THE WHIRLING KALEIDOSCOPE

Herbert Brownell resigned as National Committee Chairman of the G.O.P. Best bets for his successor are Representatives Clarence Brown of Ohio and B. Carroll Reece of Tennessee. . . . Publicity-wise Henry J. Kaiser claimed that the steel industry refused to sell to the Kaiser-Frazer Corporation, and asked U.S. Attorney General Tom Clark to end this "discrimination." Pard'ner Frazer hinted that Kaiser's quick signing of labor contracts was one reason for no steel. But within a week after this tempest, U.S. Steel and Great Lakes steel promised enough material to the corporation to make cars . . . For the first time in four years, the Treasury in February took in more money than it paid out, by a round $168,000,000. The fiscal year starting this July may see a balanced budget.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW LEADER

IS PROUD TO ANNOUNCE

THE APPOINTMENT OF TWO OUTSTANDING WRITERS ON NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AS ASSOCIATE EDITORS

DAVID J. DALLIN: Distinguished historian and political analyst; author of THE REAL SOVIET RUSSIA; SOVIET RUSSIA'S FOREIGN POLICY; THE BIG THREE; RUSSIA AND POST-WAR EUROPE.

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN: Former foreign correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor in Russia, Japan and key European cities; author of THE WORLD'S IRON AGE; HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION; CONFESSIONS OF AN INDIVIDUALIST; AMERICA: PARTNER IN WORLD RULE; etc.

★ ★ ★

ALSO A NEW FEATURE

WORLD EVENTS: In line with America's closer participation in world affairs *The New Leader* has inaugurated a Monthly supplement section in permanent magazine form, prepared by leading experts, and featuring each month an interpretative close-up study of an important current problem. These supplement sections are invaluable for purposes of reference. The following issues have appeared to date: The Balkans, Battleground of Two Worlds; Germany, Between War and Peace; The Changing Far East; New Developments In Internal Postwar Soviet Russia; The Real Meaning of Industrial Strikes.

★ ★ ★

Coming Soon in the New Leader

Articles By

DOROTHY THOMPSON	R. COUDENHOVEKALERGI	LEWIS MUMFORD
JERRY VOORHIS	WILLIAM AGAR	EVA WUNDERLICH
KATHERINE LENROOT	BORIS J. NICOLAEVSKY	BERNARD HELLER
GOV. ELLIS ARNALL	LEON BLUM	FRANCIS DOWNING
H. N. BRAILSFORD	LOUIS DE BROUCKERE	GERHART H. SEGER
WENDELL BERGE	KARL RENNER	MAURICE WILLIAM

THE MEN WHO MAKE THE NEWS WRITE FOR THE NEW LEADER!

The New Leader, 7 East 15th Street, New York 3, New York

NAME.....ZONE.....

ADDRESS.....CITY.....STATE.....

$3 for fifty two issues and twelve free monthly magazine supplements; $2 for six months; $1 for three month trial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM FEATURES

In the last of a series of four articles on "Our Human Predicament," **Theodore M. Greene** has examined the rôle of the church in our society. In previous articles, Professor Greene has discussed the fundamental problem of mankind, the state and the family and the function of knowledge.

Educational Director of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, **Mark Starr** spent part of last fall in London where he served as an adviser to the delegation setting up the International Education Office under the U.N.O. charter. He is the author of "Trade Unions: Democratic or Bureaucratic" which appears in this issue.

S. F. Welty ("Poppies in Politics"), formerly Speech Professor at Parsons College, is now a free-lance writer contributing articles to several current periodicals on social and scientific subjects.

Now Professor of History and head of the Department of History and Political Science at Wheaton College, **Ernest J. Knapton** received his early education at the University of British Columbia, Oxford University (Rhodes Scholar) and Harvard University. Besides articles in historical journals dealing with nineteenth century and recent diplomatic history, Mr. Knapton is the author of **The Lady of the Holy Alliance: The Life of Julie de Krüdener** (New York, Columbia, 1939). In his articles for CURRENT HISTORY, he has long specialized on France.

Since 1896 when he joined the **Philadelphia Press, Oswald Garrison Villard** has been editor, publisher, correspondent and student of the press. He was editorial writer and president of the **New York Evening Post** from 1897 to 1918 and editor and owner of **The Nation** from 1918 to 1932. As a student of the press, Mr. Villard has lectured throughout the country and has written, among other books, **Newspapers and Newspaper Men**, and **The Disappearing Daily,** both of which have been widely read and studied as first class commentaries on the American Press. A "Responsible Press?" is taken from one of his columns in **The Progressive.**

For the laymen both the European and the Pacific wars have been over since August, 1945. As yet, however, there has been no official declaration to that effect by President Truman or by Congress. What does this mean? Should Congress declare the war ended? **C. L. Thompson** says yes; **Arnaud Bruce Leavelle** says no. See the Forum on page 720.

Next month FORUM will present articles by Lewis A. Dexter, of Bryn Mawr College; David V. Cleary, Mark Starr, Paul H. Landis, Sidney B. Fay and others.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED